

THE EVANGELICAL REVIEW.

NO. XXXVI.

APRIL, 1858.

ARTICLE I.

THE THREE SAXON ELECTORS OF THE ERA OF THE REFORMATION.

By Charles F. Schaeffer, D. D., German Professor of N. T. Exegesis, &c., Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa.

NO. I.

THE ELECTORS who are frequently mentioned in the history of the German Empire, constituted originally a college of several sovereign princes, in whom was vested the right of electing the head of the empire. Their German title of *Churfürst* or *Kurfürst*, equivalent to a *prince who elects*, is derived from an old German verb, *churen* or *kören*, to choose or elect. After the extinction of the German branch of the Carlovingian house in the tenth century, several of the most powerful dukes, who ruled over the Bavarians, Saxons, Suabians, &c., united in appointing an individual to whom the imperial office and authority were assigned. The power and rank of these dukes were gradually appropriated and retained by seven electors, three of whom were ecclesiastical princes, viz., the king of Bohemia, the Count Palatine, the *Duke of Saxony*, and the Margrave of Brandenburg. In 1356 these electoral rights and privileges were recognized, precisely defined and confirmed by the celebrated "Golden Bull,"* which long constituted a fundamental law of the German Empire.

* The provisions contained in this important document, are detailed by Hallam in his *Middle Ages*, Chap. V., and by other historians.

The earliest inhabitants of the territory which, at a later period, constituted the electorate of Saxony, are supposed to have been the Hermunduri, whom Tacitus already (De Germ. c. 41) describes in unusually favorable terms. They appear to have been succeeded by a Slavonic tribe, which was subsequently (in the ninth or tenth century) either conquered or expelled by the German race, in whose hands the country permanently remained. In consequence of the invasions of the Empire of Charlemagne's weak successors by neighboring tribes, this territory, or a large part of it, was constituted like other tracts, a *march** or military frontier, under the name of Meissen, (Misnia) and assigned to a *border count* (Graf), with the appropriate title of *margrave* (Germ. *Markgraf*, medieval Lat. *marchio*, whence the Ital. *marchese*, and French, *marquis*); in the year 1090, it became the permanent possession of the house of Wettin, to which all the reigning Saxon families of our day belong. The founder of the family, (who is himself regarded by some authorities as a descendant of the brave Wittekind of the age of Charlemagne) was Dietrich (equivalent to Theodorich). His immediate successors, all lineal descendants, were Dedo I., Dietrich II., Dedo II., and Henry the Younger. The latter, dying without issue, was succeeded by his cousin, Conrad the Devout, or, the Great, a son of Count Thimo of Wettin, margrave of Misnia; he enlarged his territory by the addition of Lower Lusatia. He was succeeded in 1157 by his son, Otto the Rich, in whose reign the silver mines of Freiberg were discovered. His successors, who were all his lineal descendants, and who greatly enlarged their ancestral lands and dignities, were his two sons, Albert and Dietrich, Henry, the son of the latter (who also acquired the landgraviate of Thuringia), Frederic, of the Bitten Check, Frederic the Grave, Frederic the Severe, and Frederic the Warlike, who died in 1428.

The reigning family of Saxony, under various geographical names, exhibits through a long period, very numerous illustrations of the principle of a division of territories among the sons of a deceased sovereign. The law of succession founded on the assumed right of primogeniture, was not, indeed, originally recognized by the Saxon race. Thus the

* The name of *marcher*, which is given to the borders of any district, is applied, in the history of England, to the boundaries between England and Wales, and England and Scotland. It is an Anglo-Saxon word, and is found in every language of Teutonic descent.

margrave last mentioned, Frederick the Warlike, appears in history, after his accession, as joint ruler with his two younger brothers, in accordance with the example of his father. He founded the University of Leipzig in 1409. The important military services which he rendered to the empire during the wars with the Hussites, induced the emperor Sigismund to elevate him, in the year 1423, to the rank of *Duke of Saxony*, and invest him with the electoral dignity, after which he was styled Frederick the First. In consequence of this accession of honor and influence, as well as of the military resources of his country, and his own great personal qualities, he became one of the most powerful princes in Germany.

He was succeeded in 1428 by his son Frederick II., the Gentle. Like his predecessors, he administered the government jointly with his brothers, but the electoral dignity was attached to his person solely, and to his issue. From him the reigning Saxon princes of our day are lineally descended. Of his five sons, only two, fortunately for the repose of the country, which was perpetually disturbed by joint reigns and territorial divisions, appear to have lived beyond the period of infancy. From these two sons, Ernest and Albert (Albert, Albrecht and Adalbert, are merely different forms of the same name), the present reigning houses, the Ernestine and the Albertine, are respectively descended. The paternal dominions were divided in 1485 by the brothers, after a joint reign of several years, and the *electoral dignity*, together with the territories originally conveyed with it, Thuringia, &c., fell to the share of Ernest, the elder brother; Albert the Courageous, received Misnia, &c., together with the *ducal* title. The latter was succeeded in 1500 by his son, George the Bearded, the well known violent enemy of Luther, whose doctrines he long labored to exclude from ducal Saxony. He was a first-cousin of Frederic the Wise, and not his uncle, as some writers erroneously allege (e. g. J. Scott, in his *Luther and the Lutheran Ref.* I. 34; Bower, *Life of Luther*, p. 136, correctly calls him a cousin.) After the death of his consort, Barbara of Poland, in 1534, George forebore to trim his beard, and thus enabled the chroniclers of his day to gratify their inclination to assign to every prince a characteristic appellation. Of his ten children, six were sons; none, however, survived him, and his dominions passed, after his death in 1539, to his brother Henry the Devout, a decided friend of the Lutheran Reformation. The latter was succeeded by his son Moritz in 1541, to whom the electoral dig-

nity was transferred from the elder branch in 1547. This event belongs to the history of John Frederic. On the death of Moritz in 1553, the electorate passed to his brother Augustus. This prince placed the Lutheran Church under lasting obligations, by the fidelity, zeal and success, with which he labored to secure for it the *Formula of Concord*, which constitutes the complement of its glorious confession of faith.

The elector Ernest, the uncle of George, was succeeded in electoral Saxony, as contradistinguished from the independent duchy of the same name, in the year 1486, by FREDERIC THE WISE, Luther's first protector, and the first of the three electors to whom the title of this article refers. As he died without legitimate issue, he was succeeded by his brother John; after the death of John, his son, John Frederic, inherited not only the paternal rank and power, but also the still more honorable office of sustaining the noble cause which Luther represented. This prince was the last of the Ernestine Saxon family who held the electoral dignity, having been compelled to resign it, in consequence of events which we shall mention in a future sketch of himself and his father, to the collateral ducal family, represented by Moritz, mentioned above.

The succession in the Albertine (Moritz's) branch, after its endowment with the electoral dignity, was uninterruptedly maintained, from father to son, or brother to brother, until one of Albert's lineal descendants, the elector Frederic Augustus I., the Strong, acquired in 1694 an additional title and a higher rank; he is known in history as Augustus II., king of Poland; the weak character, selfish ambition and private vices of this man, easily explain the circumstance that in 1697 he publicly adopted the popish religion. This renunciation of the religion of the Bible, was the cause of his separation from his consort. His son and successor, Frederic Augustus II. (Augustus III. of Poland, 1733) obtained both the electoral and the royal title of his father. His total incapacity for business, made him the mere instrument of unworthy favorites, and involved himself and his country in heavy misfortunes. This weak man, although reared in the Lutheran faith by his mother and grandmother, also became a papist. He was succeeded in 1763 by his son, Frederic Christian, whose son, the elector Frederic Augustus III., the Just (born 1750), is known in history as the first *king of Saxony*, which title he assumed in 1806. The present king of Saxony (John, born 1801), the third who has occupied the

throne since the death of the latter, is accordingly, a lineal descendant of Albert, and the representative of the *Albertine* branch.

The *Ernestine* line, after the loss of the electoral dignity, and of certain territories attached to it, received an inadequate compensation when some Thuringian cities and territories were assigned to the unfortunate John Frederic, whom we have mentioned above. At his death, his limited dominions, which had received, however, some later accessions, passed to his son John Frederic II., with the title of *duke* of Saxony. The same policy of joint reigns and of occasional distributions of the common territory among the sons of a deceased duke, continued to prevail. New principalities, such as Weimar, Coburg, &c., were founded and governed by the various representatives of the *Ernestine* branch. The seven sons of Ernest I., the Devout, for instance, who died in 1601, and who ably supported Gustavus Adolphus during the Thirty Years' War, divided the dominions of their deceased father, which had been considerably enlarged by inheritance and otherwise, into as many sovereign states. Several of these reigning families became extinct; nothing, indeed, but the decay of such families and the death of their members, could relieve Germany of a plethora of sovereigns, before the mediatising process was adopted on a large scale, at the beginning of this century. At the present time, only four ruling families remain, claiming a lineal descent from John Frederic, and representing the *Ernestine* branch. The following are the names of the principalities and their rulers at this date. 1.) The Grand Duchy of Saxe-Weimar-Eisenach.—Charles Alexander, born 1818. 2.) The Duchy of Saxe-Meiningen-Hildburghausen.—Bernhard, born 1800.—3.) The Duchy of Saxe-Altenburg.—Ernest Frederick, born 1826. 4.) The Duchy of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha.—Ernest II., born 1818. From a short German Court Calendar of 1856, which has furnished us with these names and dates, we learn that the reigning Duke last mentioned, is an older brother of Prince Albert, the consort of Queen Victoria, whose birth in 1819 is three months later than her own.

Victoria herself, like Albert, her husband, can boast of distinguished Lutheran parentage, on referring to the earlier history of the Reformation. She is, through George II., king of England, (the founder of the celebrated University of Göttingen) a lineal descendant of George I., styled in the history of the present *kingdom* of Hanover, the elector

George Lewis. He inherited the British crown in 1714, as the son of Sophia, to whom and to whose Protestant descendants, the succession of that crown was limited by the well known "Act of Settlement" of 1700, which year Macaulay's last published volume has not reached. The electress Sophia was a daughter of Elizabeth, Queen of Bohemia, and through her, a grand-daughter of James I., of England. Her consort, the father of George I., was Ernest Augustus, duke of Hanover, of the house of Brunswick-Lunenberg, who obtained the electoral dignity in 1692; he received the investiture as Elector of Brunswick, in the same year, after a delay occasioned by the emperor Leopold, a bigoted papist, who desired that "another popish electorate should be created, to balance the advantage which the Lutherans would reap from that of Hanover." (Smollett's Continuation of Hume's History of England. Book I. Ch. 3. § 37.) He was the lineal descendant, heir and representative of the house of Brunswick-Lunenberg, the founder of which was William the Younger, who died in 1592. The reader will find his name among those of the distinguished "Electors, Princes and Estates," who attached their signatures to the Introduction or Preface to the original edition in 1580 of the "Book of Concord," that is, the collection of Symbolical Books recognized by the Evangelical Lutheran Church. The list of names occupies several pages in Müller's well known edition (pp. 22—26.) This prince occupies a truly honorable position in the history of the Church, as one of the most active supporters of the cause of divine truth, as set forth in the Formula of Concord, and the other invaluable confessions embraced in the volume. (See Neudecker: *Gesch. des ev. Protestant.* I. 351). George II., the descendant of this zealous Lutheran, regularly maintained at his court the services of the German Lutheran Church, after his own accession. His court-chaplain, Ziegenhagen, manifested a deep and active interest in the establishment of the Lutheran Church in this country, as the numerous letters addressed to him by the patriarch Muhlenberg and others, abundantly demonstrate. They are preserved in the "Hallische Nachrichten," copies of which have recently been furnished to all the Lutheran Institutions of this country by the munificence of one of his descendants. (See an editorial in the Pittsburg "Missionary" of Nov. 26, 1857.) We find the name of George II. introduced in the Litany, after the prayer for all rulers, &c., as regularly read at the morning service in the "German Lutheran Court-chapel of St. James."

The copy of the German Liturgy before us, was published in London in 1757, precisely a century ago, and is a 16mo volume of 257 pages,* including "die Leidensgeschichte, &c."

The children of Albert and Victoria, some of whose royal ancestors we have here introduced, cannot find in the long list of their noble and royal predecessors, among whom many devout Lutherans appear, any who occupy a more honorable place in the history of the world and of the Church of Christ, in view of their unfeigned faith and brilliant virtues, than their Lutheran ancestors, the electoral princes of Saxony.

After this extended genealogical statement, the particulars of which we have, with considerable labor, collected from a number of sources,† and which we believe to be strictly accurate, we shall confine our attention to the three most distinguished of the whole number of princes whom we have mentioned, beginning with

FREDERIC THE WISE.

(*Fridericus, Sapiens.*)

On Monday, January 17, in the year 1463, a courier was sent from the castle of Torgan (now belonging to Prussian Saxony), with an official letter addressed to the court of Weimar, conveying the gratifying tidings that Elizabeth, the daughter of Duke Albert III., of Bavaria, and the consort of the electoral prince, Duke Ernest of Saxony, "had, on that day, received from the goodness and bounty of the Almighty, a noble young son." That son, who was, with almost a prophetic feeling, received by his devout parents as a specially gracious gift of the Lord, is known in history as the elector Frederic III., the Wise.

* The words on the title page are: "Zum Gebrauch der königlichen Deutschen Lutherischen Hof-Capelle zu St. James eingerichtet." This is the Liturgy used by Ziegenhagen himself, as the date of its publication, compared with the dates of Dr. Muhlenberg's letters to him, clearly prove. The copy before us belonged to the Rev. Emanuel Schulze, who inscribed his name on the title page, having probably received it from Ziegenhagen himself. For we learn from the *Hall. Nachr.* (Vorbericht, § 6 to "Neunte Fortsetzung," that after the death of Pastor Handschuh, of Philadelphia, Ziegenhagen was entreated to send a successor; the choice fell on Candidate Schulze, who was at once sent to England. Thence he proceeded to Philadelphia, where he afterwards officiated as one of the pastors of St. Michael's and Zion churches (Hall. Nahr. p. 1254).

† A recent publication: *Kleineres Brockhaus'sches Convers. Lex.*, containing many short articles, not found in the larger work, has rendered us material service in gathering the foregoing historical details.

His father, Ernest, was distinguished for the integrity and firmness which belonged to his character, and for his love of order, his self-command and cultivated taste. His efforts to furnish his children with a judicious education, and, specially, to train them up in the fear of God, were ably seconded both by the electress, and by the child's grandmother, Margaret, the intelligent and intrepid sister of the emperor Frederic IV. When the young prince subsequently became a pupil at the cathedral-school of Grimma, he was not only found to possess a very retentive memory and a quick understanding, but he also manifested an unusual thirst for learning. He himself often referred, in his later years, to the divine mercy which had placed him under the influence of such able and faithful teachers as Ulrich Kemmerlin, Dr. Pollick and others, who were counted among the most eminent scholars of their day.

The mortification which Ernest had on one occasion experienced, when he found himself unable to write a Latin letter of thanks to the Pope for the gift of a consecrated golden rose (in 1480), increased his anxiety to secure a classical education for his sons. Frederic scarcely needed the encouraging counsels of his parent; his own tastes led him to select Seneca, Terence and Horace as his favorite authors. Suitors, at a later period, often found him a more ready listener to their petitions, when these were graced with happy quotations from such writings. He was also a very diligent student of history, and cultivated music with ardor and delight, rarely traveling without the attendance of his musicians and Conrad von Ruppich, their able conductor. He excelled in all the manly exercises of his age, and his equestrian feats, in particular, attracted universal admiration.

He continued to pursue his studies under the direction of the elector of Mayence, at whose court he acquired a complete knowledge of the French language. He then visited the court of the emperor Frederic, where his cultivated manners, the purity of his private life, and his great abilities, secured him a high position. At a still later period, he won so completely the affections of the emperor Maximilian, that he was invited to accompany the latter on many of his journeys in Germany and the Netherlands. His travels enlarged his views, and tended to develop those traits of character, to which he was indebted for the appellation of *the Wise*, which, possibly, in this case, is equivalent to *discreet*. While the sons of the princes of that age neglected the cultivation of

their minds, and were ambitious of acquiring distinction by feats of physical strength, Frederic received an unusually complete education; his intellectual and moral training, in which respects he enjoyed peculiar advantages, qualified him to render those services, at a subsequent period, to the cause of religion, for which he was evidently selected by Providence, among all his contemporaries.

He was twenty-three years old at the period of his father's death, which occurred August 26, 1846. As the oldest son, he inherited the electoral dignity, together with the electoral dominions, agreeably to the provisions of the "Golden Bull" of 1356; he complied, however, strictly with his father's wish, by associating with himself his brother John, in the administration of the government. This arrangement, which was characterized by uninterrupted harmony, as well as by sincere fraternal affection and confidence, was maintained during a period of forty years, until Frederic died.

Ernestine or Electoral Saxony, the boundaries, number of square miles, &c., of which, at that particular period, we have not been able to ascertain with precision,* contained at Fred-

* Burdach, in his short popular tract (*Friedrich der Weise &c., dem Volke erzählt.* Hamburg, 1854), to which we are largely indebted in the preparation of this article, condenses nearly all the information which we could collect on this point, in the following statement: "Das Ernestinische Sachsen (die Meissischen Lande waren an die Albertinische Linie gekommen) reichte von Heldburg in Franken bis Belzig, von Kreutzburg an der Werra bis gegen Aunaberg im Erzgebirge. Es war 72 Stunden lang und 48 Stunden breit, und hatte auf 342 Quadrat-Meilen etwa 900,000 Einwohner." Burdach, who does not design to give the statistics minutely, here specifies only the extreme points of the territory, which, by no means, presented a rectangular figure. The apparent inconsistency between the dimensions which he gives, and the number of square miles, may also be explained by a reference to the exact proportion between the German *Stunde*, loosely estimated at three English miles, and the German geographical mile, of which fifteen constituted a degree. With this mile, the ordinary German mile (equal to four English miles and three-fifths, Stein's *kl. Geogr.* p. 5, and assumed to be two *Stunden* in length) does not precisely coincide. Burdach may have also deducted from the whole number of square miles, that portion of the surface which was not cultivated, but occupied by the Erzgebirge (Ore Mts.), a chain of mountains dividing Saxony from Bohemia. Statisticians assign in our day, in the Saxon states, 276 inhabitants to a square mile, in England and Wales 274, France 168, China 240, Hindooostan 115, &c. In an able article in the *London Times* of Nov. 30, 1857, (copied into the *New York Herald* of Dec. 20) the writer, after speaking of Delhi, its recent capture by the British troops, &c., refers to Oude, which the mutineer army still held at that date, and then adds: "The population is computed to be the thickest in India, numbering more than 300 to the square mile, a density unknown even in England."

eric's accession, about 900,000 inhabitants. It was regarded as the most productive, and, in reference to its scenery and improved cultivation, as the most beautiful, of all the German territories. The long and wise administration of Frederic, tended to develop all its resources to the utmost extent; at his death Melanchthon said that the golden age had returned during his reign. The practical turn of his mind led him to give a new impulse to agriculture, manufactures and trade in general. The silver mines of Schneeberg yielded their richest treasures, the public roads were improved, the exactions of the lawless nobles were suppressed, and the civil rights of the meanest subject strictly maintained. As a prince of the empire, Frederic exhibited similar abilities. His disinterested efforts, as a mediator, in reconciling contending princes, his wise counsels, his enlightened patriotism and incorruptible justice, secured for him the esteem and confidence not only of the German, but also of all foreign princes. Maximilian indicated his sense of Frederic's merits by confirming him in the high office of Vicar of the Empire. The popes of Rome earnestly sought to maintain friendly relations with him; at the regular diets or convocations of the empire, more than thirty of which he attended, no member labored more effectually to extricate the country from the embarrassments in which Maximilian found it involved at his accession; and the peace, order and stability in its affairs, which were gradually secured, were acknowledged to be the result mainly of Frederic's wise statesmanship and admirable conduct. In consequence of his eminent services, the German princes, after the death of Maximilian, concurred in offering the imperial crown to Frederic, as the most worthy and able of their number.

Frederic was seriously perplexed on this occasion. Personal considerations, selfish ambition, love of power, and similar springs of action, could not influence him; still, the decision was difficult. Not one of the candidates for the crown, as Frederic well knew, was in a position to ascend the throne and reign as a strictly *German* monarch, independently of foreign interests, while he alone could administer the affairs of the empire with a strict and exclusive regard to the national interests. But he was conscious, on the other hand, that a German emperor in his age, could not effectually maintain internal peace, nor successfully repel foreign invaders, unless he was supported by a powerful military force derived from his own hereditary dominions. The comparative weakness of his electorate, ultimately induced him to refuse the

crown, and to decide in favor of the election of Charles V. This personage, although apparently grateful to Frederic, to whom alone he owed his elevation, and eager to express his sense of obligation, often grieved his benefactor; his heartless conduct extorted on one occasion from Frederic, in Spalatin's presence, the passionate exclamation: "I have no friend on earth, except my brother John."

It was one of Frederic's principles, in the government of his own territories, to impose only indispensable taxes on his subjects, and observe a wise economy in the expenditures of his court; he even resisted, on one occasion, the earnest solicitations and the threats of the emperor and the pope, when they desired him to levy taxes in view of an approaching war with the Turks; he alleged that large amounts of money had been collected for a similar object on previous occasions, and that these had not been expended in warring against the enemy of the Cross, but had been appropriated to private purposes. The costly churches and palaces, however, which he reared, compelled him, in 1516, to impose a heavy burden on his people, in the form of a tax on all property both real and personal. Pfeffinger, one of his counsellors, whom he regarded as a faithful servant, but who was extremely unpopular, bore the whole odium of the measure. Even Luther distrusted him, and believed him to be covetous. De Wette has preserved in his invaluable collection of Luther's letters (Vol. I. p. 77, No. 48) a letter of the Reformer, written to the elector on this occasion. It seems that the latter had promised to supply Luther with a piece of cloth for a new garment. Luther begs the elector not to forget his promise, and significantly adds, that if Pfeffinger should be commissioned to attend to the business, he hopes that the latter will not slight it, inasmuch as Pfeffinger could always furnish *words, very good words*, but that *good cloth* did not usually come from them. He then, very candidly rebukes the elector, on account of the imposition of the tax. Frederic at this early period already, too highly appreciated Luther's lofty character to take offence. Luther obtained the coat, but could not prevent the imposition of the tax.

On several occasions Frederic was nearly involved in dangerous and expensive wars. His wise policy, however, his firmness in maintaining his own rights, his respect for those of others, his concessions, when his dignity and the cause of justice permitted them, and his foresight, secured for his country the blessings of peace, insomuch that his pacific char-

acter, marked as it was by strength, gained for him a higher reputation abroad, and for his people greater advantages than the most brilliant military achievements could have won.

Frederic needed no prime-minister, but governed, as well as reigned, himself. Several able men were, however, attached to his person as counsellors, the choice of whom indicates the uncommon penetration and lofty principles which he possessed. As their personal merit secured his confidence, their names are still mentioned with honor. Among these were Chancellor Brueck, George Spalatin, private secretary, the lords von Feilitzsch and von Einsiedel, Dr. Schurf and Dr. Pauli. Dr. Pollick, styled by his contemporaries, *lux mundi*, and Staupitz, the learned and devout Provincial or Vicar-General of the Augustinian monks in Germany, were also highly esteemed, and their advice often solicited. While Frederic gladly availed himself of the counsels of the wise, he also exercised his own judgment in every matter, and when his conscience assured him, after he had consulted the divine word, and appealed to the throne of grace, that he was in the path of duty, he adhered to his convictions with unyielding tenacity. Long after his death (in 1534), Luther, while commenting on Ps. 101, takes occasion to pay a beautiful tribute to the memory of his "lieber Herr," extols the accuracy and solidity of his judgment, and praises God who bestowed such wisdom on the prince. It was neither obstinacy nor pride of opinion that controlled the elector, but a sense of duty to God and man. His independent habits of thought led Prince Balthasar of Schwarzburg to remark on one occasion: "If Frederic had not been born a prince, he would, at least, have became the chief magistrate in his village." He was daily strengthened by the study of the New Testament, and often spoke with gratitude to God, of the light and comfort which it never failed to afford.

Few princes have exhibited equal industry; his close attention to business often caused Spalatin to ask: "When dost thou sleep?" Even on his hunting expeditions, he was attended by a secretary; his letters were carefully prepared, and often re-written, before they were dispatched. His excellent memory enabled him to transact a large amount of business with great facility.

It may readily be supposed that a ruler like Frederic, who possessed such an enlightened mind, would devote much attention to the cause of education in his dominions. The educational facilities in Saxony, were, accordingly, in his day,

at least equal to those of any country in Europe ; one school alone, in Zwickan, was attended by more than eight hundred pupils. The nephew of the elector, John Frederic, was an object of the most tender solicitude, and no efforts were spared to qualify him fully for the post which he afterwards occupied with so much honor, and such fidelity to the cause of religion. The elector maintained an active correspondence with all the learned men of his age ; the honorable tribute which Erasmus rendered to Luther, both at interviews with the elector, and in his letters, materially influenced Frederic to sustain a man who was so worthy of his protection. Learned men of Italy, France and other countries, combined to extol the merits of Frederic, dedicated their writings to him, and were ambitious to visit his court and be presented to a ruler so wise and accomplished as the civilized world acknowledged Frederic to be.

The establishment of the University of Wittenberg constituted an era in his life ; his disinterested motives in founding this institution, are expressed in the original charter which he gave, and in which he says : "We have established this High School for the glory of God, &c." The first official proclamation of his purpose, was made by the elector jointly with his brother John, in a document dated August 24, 1501. The papal sanction or confirmation was given Feb. 2, 1502. On July 6, 1502, the emperor Maximilian granted to the proposed institution, all the rights and privileges which were enjoyed by the famous schools of Bologna, Padua, Paris, &c. The solemn opening of the institution occurred on the 18th of October, 1502 ; Dr. Fleck, a Franciscan monk, pronounced the consecration sermon, and, as a remarkable circumstance, which deserves to be mentioned here, foretold in the discourse, in allusion to the signification of the old German name *Witten Berg* (weiss-Berg) that "from this white mountain true wisdom should be diffused throughout the world," little knowing, however, in what manner that prediction would subsequently be fulfilled through Luther's agency. Extensive landed property, eminent offices and dignities, valuable books and manuscripts, and unusual privileges were granted to the University, and it at once assumed the highest rank as a learned institution.

The enlightened views of those who directed its internal affairs, among whom were Prof. Pollick, the first rector, Stau-pitz, &c., gave the institution a peculiar character ; the Scholastic theology received little countenance. In 1508 Luther,

at the early age of twenty-five, was appointed Professor of Philosophy, and commenced to lecture on Physics and Dialectics, but received, the following year, a new appointment to lecture on theological science. It was at this period that Frederic's attention was specially directed to the Reformer. In 1517 two new professorships were established, one for the Greek, the other for the Hebrew language. The elector, by the advice of Reuchlin, the most eminent Greek scholar in Germany, assigned the former chair, in 1518, to Melanchthon, who was then twenty-two years old. At the early period of the foundation of the University, while the Lord was training Luther in Erfurt for the great work appointed for him, the Virgin Mary and St. Augustine were selected from the list of saints, which presented, indeed, few subjects of a better quality, as the tutelar saints of the entire establishment; for special purposes, the theological faculty selected St. Paul; the Law faculty, St. Ivo; the Medical, Kosmas and Damianus; and the Philosophical, St. Catharine.

We may here, perhaps, introduce with propriety an episode, the details of which are strictly authentic, but which are not generally known, although they possess considerable interest. Long after the period of the Crusades, devout persons frequently visited the Holy Land, surveyed the site of Bethlehem, trod on Golgotha, lingered at the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem, and, as papists by education, diligently collected sacred relics. Frederic's uncle, Duke Albert, had performed this pilgrimage in 1476, and, at a still earlier period (in 1461), his grandfather, Duke William of Thuringia, had also visited the Holy Land. A few years after Frederic had become a sovereign prince himself, he resolved to imitate their example. "I will," said he, "invest my authority, as a ruler, with a religious character, by lowering my sceptre before the Lord." He determined, also, to bring home some fragment of the holy cross, if such remained, or at least a portion of the earth in the vicinity of the Savior's grave, that the daily view of such objects might perpetually remind him of his Redeemer. Frederic was sincerely devout in heart at that time, and although still an adherent of the papal religion, his soul was beginning its struggles to emancipate itself from the bondage of popish superstitions. Amid these struggles, while he was famishing through lack of knowledge and peace, and could not find the true way of worshipping God, his anxiety to collect relics amounted to a passion. Even as late as 1516, he sent Staupitz to the Netherlands for the purpose of obtaining

some articles of this class, which were said to be deposited in a monastery.

Another motive, somewhat romantic in its nature, is said to have also, indirectly at least, induced Frederic to undertake this pilgrimage.* He was engaged in a hunting expedition during the summer of 1492. As he rode forth on a certain day, he observed, as he approached a fountain at the roadside, a very beautiful young lady, who sat near it, and was weeping. On inquiring into the cause of her affliction, he ascertained that she was the Countess Amelia, of the noble house of Mannsfeld. The interest which he evidently took in her grief, and which was, possibly, deepened by her beauty and highly-wrought feeling, led her to confide the whole tale of her sorrows to her sympathizing hearer, of whose high rank she was ignorant. It appeared that it had been her hard fate to have been married, contrary to her own inclinations, to Count Henry of Schwarzbburg, a morose old man, from whom nothing but neglect and unkindness could be expected. Frederic soothingly offered to render her any services in his power, although he seems to have distinctly intimated at the same time, that, in consequence of the unfaithfulness of one whom he had once loved, he had resolved that while he lived, he would not only never marry, but not even form the most slender tie of friendship and affection with any woman. Still, the Countess accepted his offer of aid, and added that the evidence of the sincerity of his promise should consist, first, in his personal appearance at a tournament, appointed to take place at an early day at the castle of Schwarzbburg, and, secondly, in a pilgrimage which he should undertake to the Holy Land. These conditions certainly seem to imply that the parties had become deeply interested in each other during their first interview, and made considerable progress in the expression of their sentiments. On the day of the tournament the elector appeared as a foreign knight, but was easily recognized by the Countess, who now first ascertained his real rank. A year after this event, he commenced his pilgrimage to the Holy Land.

* Burdach regards the statement that such a motive influenced the Elector, as of somewhat doubtful authority. He also refers to one of Frederic's contemporaries and court-officers, Adam von Hammerstein, who, in the year 1496, introduced the incidents which we relate into a poem, entitled: "The Stag with the golden antlers, and the Princess at the fountain." It must be confessed that such a title indicates a ballad rather than a composition entitled to the rank of an historical document. Even such poems, however, are often founded on facts.

The scanty materials before us, do not authorize us even to conjecture that the parties distinctly proposed to form a closer tie than that of mere acquaintanceship, as soon as the death of the aged husband should remove the only obstacle to their union. In the absence of any positive statement, we may with propriety assume, in view of Frederic's well known character and principles, that no indiscreet act was committed by him, and that it was chiefly his readiness to succor any unhappy individual, which drew him to the castle. If he and the Countess did entertain for each other such sentiments as might have possibly awakened secret hopes of a future union, those hopes were never fulfilled. The Countess died in 1517, even before her consort was called away from the world, and Frederic, who does not appear to have seen her again, remained unmarried to his end. In his last will he confers a legacy on the mother of his two natural sons, Frederic and Sebastian, and provides for them also. Seckendorf relates (p. 705 of the Germ.) that he did not mention the mother's name (who could not have been the Countess Amelia), that he mentioned his sons simply with the familiar abbreviations of Fritz and Bastel, and that he desired the whole clause referring to them and their mother, to remain a secret. This wish was communicated to his successor by his secretary, who wrote the will, and by Spalatin. The elector appears to have sincerely repented of the sin which he committed at an early period, when the example of his peers, and the facility of obtaining a popish absolution, had greatly depressed the standard of Christian morality. (Sebastian is said to have entered the service of Christiern II. of Denmark). This guilty connection of the elector with the mother of his sons, doubtless weighed on his mind when he dictated his last will, which begins with the words: "I beseech Almighty God, through the holy and sole merit of his Son, to forgive all my sins and infirmities," &c.

Before Frederic departed for Jerusalem, he entrusted the whole government to his brother John, made a will which he subsequently revoked, provided additional aid for certain poor students of the University, laid the foundation of a chapel in Torgau, styled the "chapel of the sacred cross," and then commenced his journey, March 19, 1493. Many nobles and prelates of his own and of contiguous territories, Duke Christopher of Bavaria, &c., accompanied him. The eminent painter, Lucas Kranach, was also attached to the expedition. They sailed from Venice in a galleon, which was scarcely of

sufficient capacity to accommodate three hundred and twenty persons, the whole number of those on board. They touched at Ragusa, near the Turkish borders, for the purpose of obtaining a supply of provisions, at Corfu, Candia, and, at length, reached the island of Rhodes. Here they were hospitably received by the Grand Master of the knights of St. John, and gazed with admiration on the fortifications of the island, and with awe and wonder on the relics of the saints in the church. On the 21st of June, they landed at Jaffa, and, after meeting with various impediments, reached Jerusalem on the 27th of the same month.

The Mussulmans permitted the pilgrims to visit the sacred places, and even to pass three nights in the temple, from four o'clock, P. M. to six o'clock, A. M. On Saturday night, precisely at twelve o'clock, Henry of Schaumberg, who had already, on a former occasion, visited the holy places, and been made a knight of the Holy Sepulchre, conferred this order of knighthood on the elector, who then rendered the same service to the princes, counts and other nobles who attended him. On the following Tuesday evening they left the holy city. The princes had, for obvious reasons, preserved a strict *incognito* in Jerusalem; but when they returned to Jaffa, their Saracen guards began to suspect the high rank of the pilgrims, and attempted to extort an unusual amount of money; a violent struggle, that might have occasioned bloodshed, was, with great difficulty, prevented. On Friday the elector went on board his vessel; the flourish of trumpets, the electoral banner fluttering at the mast's head, and the loud reports of the artillery of the vessel, mingling with the notes of the *Te Deum*, joyfully sung by all on the deck, proclaimed the elector's farewell to the Holy Land. He reached Torgan safely, in September, conducting with him a large treasure in relics, which he had secured. He was still a Roman Catholic.

It was indeed very slowly that he could divest himself of the religious prejudices and superstitious notions in which he had been reared, and which, in his ignorance, he confounded with revealed religion. Thus he had originally collected about five thousand relics in his church of All Saints in Wittenberg, but he ultimately succeeded in amassing about nineteen thousand. These were deposited in costly cases of gold, silver, ivory, glass, stone and wood; many of the latter were distinguished for their elegant workmanship. These relics, really constituting a museum of religious curiosities, were ex-

hibited to the people on All-Saints'-Day (Nov. 1), for the purpose of receiving the homage of the devout; on several of these occasions Luther, who already understood the folly of the act, was greatly annoyed. Frederic's ignorance of religion still directed his devotional acts in a wrong channel. After his return from his pilgrimage, whilst the fervor of the journey continued, he caused medals to be struck with the legend: "Help, O St. Ann!" and even obtained from pope Alexander VI., in 1494, a special brief, authorizing him to appoint an additional festival in honor of St. Ann (the mother of the Virgin Mary, according to tradition), in his dominions, which should rank with the highest festivals of the church. His intercourse, however, with Staupitz, Spalatin and Pollick, who were all animated by the same devout spirit, and who earnestly sought to know and to do the divine will, while it maintained his devotional feelings in all their vigor, gradually purified and deepened them, until Luther's direct influence began to operate. Pollick said of Luther, at an early date: "This monk will reform the whole church, for he searches the writings of the prophets and apostles, and establishes himself on the word of Jesus Christ, which none can overthrow." The elector's intentions were always pure and disinterested, and his progress from darkness to light is deeply interesting. Luther had preached a sermon against the papal indulgences in 1517, but earlier than Oct. 31, and attracted to himself, in some degree, the displeasure of the elector by it; on investigating the matter, however, he was induced to justify Luther, and prohibited the sale of indulgences in his dominions, without regarding the anger of the pope; the prohibition was published shortly before the appearance of Luther's ninety-five theses.

When the latter took the decisive step on the 31st of October, 1517, of affixing these propositions to the church door—a step that, in the Providence of God, led to the Reformation itself—the cautious elector expressed his approbation of Luther's views, but uttered a warning against the adoption of violent measures. He did not live to read the Augsburg Confession; still, the Lord had granted him already much light; possibly his remarkable dream of that period, may indicate his private views of the pope, of Luther, and of the course which events would probably take;* for after he began

* Upham mentions an analogous case in his interesting work: *Outlines of imperfect and disordered mental action*, page 170. "Franklin," says he, "has somewhere made the remark, that the bearings and results

to discern the truth which Luther had already commenced to diffuse, his progress in knowledge was very rapid. We have no reason whatever to doubt the character of the evidence which we possess, that Frederic really had the dream to which we refer. It is related by Spalatin, who received the narrative from the lips of the prince himself. Frederic's constitutional reserve would not permit the Reformer's friends to divulge the fact at first, and they themselves subsequently deemed it wise to mention it but rarely, lest their enemies should allege that the Reformation was established on dreams. Such causes led to the silence which was long observed respecting it.

Frederic and his brother John were in Schweinitz, several miles distant from Wittenberg, Luther's residence, on the 30th of October, 1517, and spent the following night there. The next morning—it was the morning of the memorable day on which Luther affixed his ninety-five theses to the church door—Spalatin entered the apartment of the elector, where he found John also present. After having disposed of some subjects, on which Frederic desired to give instructions to his secretary, who was permitted, as a trusted servant and confidential friend, to share in the conversation, the following dialogue occurred between the two brothers. We merely reproduce here the account given by Spalatin. Seckendorf and other writers have related the dream, but we find the fullest statement in Burdach's little work, *our obligations to which we have already acknowledged.*

FRED.—My brother, I must tell you a dream which I had last night: I greatly wish to know its meaning. It was so distinct, and made so deep an impression on me, that I should never forget it, if I lived a thousand years. Thrice did it visit me, each time more fully developed and extended.

JOHN.—Was it a good or a bad dream?

FRED.—We cannot tell. God alone knows.

JOHN.—My brother, let not your Grace attach too much importance to it. Whenever I have a dream, I always beseech God to cause all to end well. At the same time, I must say that I have had both good and bad dreams on various occasions, which afterwards were found to agree with

of political events, which had caused him much trouble while awake, were not unfrequently unfolded to him in dreaming." The same author's explanatory remarks on Dreaming, in his *Mental Philosophy*, I., 204, and the facts which he adduces, (e. g. one in § 165) strikingly illustrate the dream related above.

passing events. Still, they usually referred only to ordinary or unimportant matters. But tell me now, your Grace, what you did dream.

FRED.—I will tell you. I retired last night to my chamber, much fatigued, and fell asleep while I was engaged in prayer. After sleeping nearly three hours, I awoke, reflected on many subjects, and determined to appoint a fast, to be observed by myself and my court, in honor of the saints. I also prayed for the repose of the poor souls in Purgatory, and determined to aid them in their misery. Then I besought God graciously to direct me, my counsellors, and all my people, in the way of truth, and to prepare us all for eternal blessedness; I also entreated him to resist with his almighty power, all wicked men, who oppose us and our lawful authority. Amid these thoughts, when it was midnight, I again fell asleep. I dreamed then that the Almighty God sent a monk to me, of a respectable appearance, who was a natural son of the blessed apostle, St. Paul. He was accompanied, according to God's divine command, by all the blessed saints, and these were commissioned to bear witness in my presence, that the monk contemplated no fraud nor evil thing, but that he was a messenger of God. They also informed me that God commanded me to allow this monk to write certain things on my church in Wittenberg, and that I would not have reason to regret the occurrence. Then, in my dream, I directed my chancellor to reply, that since God had given me such a command, and since the monk was furnished with such uncommonly weighty testimonials, he was at liberty to write all that it had been made his duty to write. The monk began to write; the letters which he made, were of such an extraordinary size, that I distinctly perceived them, even here at Schweinitz. He handled, besides, a pen of such uncommon length, that it extended to Rome, and pierc'd one of the ears of a lion that was lying in the city. It next passed through the other ear, and, stretching still further, it reached the triple crown of the pope. It struck with such force against the crown, that the latter began to totter, and threatened to fall from the head of his Holiness, the pope. While it was falling, I thought that you, my brother, and I, were standing not far off, and that I stretched forth my hand, in order to come to the aid of the crown. The rapid movement which I made, awakened me, and I found myself at the moment holding up my arm on high. Terrified as I was, on first awaking, I also felt indignant that the monk, while writing,

did not guide his pen with more discretion. But when I collected my thoughts, I perceived that the whole was a dream. Soon afterwards I fell asleep again, but the same dream recurred, and the monk again gave me trouble. He was still engaged in writing; his pen continued to pierce the lion, and through the latter, wounded the pope (Leo X., *lion*). I now heard the lion roar so terrifically, that all the inhabitants of Rome, and all the high estates of the empire, hastened to the spot in amazement, anxiously inquiring after the cause of the tumult. His Holiness, the Pope, then earnestly addressed the assembly, begged them to arrest the movements of the monk, and urged them to give me intelligence of his crime, inasmuch as he sojourned in my dominions.

The excitement which the scene produced in me, roused me again; on awaking, I felt amazed that the dream had been repeated, but concluded that it was a temptation which I ought to resist. While I was praying to God that he would graciously preserve His Holiness, the Pope, from all evil, I again fell asleep. Then I dreamed that the princes and dignitaries of the whole empire, among whom you, my brother, and I myself, appeared, were assembled in Rome. We were earnestly laboring to break the pen of the monk, and rescue the pope from the distress which it occasioned. But the more vigorously we attempted to pluck out the pen, the more obstinately it bristled up, stiffened itself, and at last scratched and jarred so discordantly, that both my ears tingled, and we were all sorely distressed. At length we became impatient and weary—one after the other withdrew from the work, each beginning to suspect that the monk was more than he seemed to be, and to fear that he might possibly direct his pen against one of our number. Nevertheless, I caused the inquiry to be addressed to him (for I was at one moment in Rome, and, at another in Wittenberg), whence he had procured that pen, and how it chanced to be so strong and tough. He replied that it came from a *goose** a hundred years old, and that it had been bestowed on him by his teacher, with the request that, as it possessed great value, he should keep and use it well, in memory of the giver. The monk added that he had himself afterwards clarified the quill, and he explained that its length, stiffness and power, proceeded from the circumstance that no man was able to withdraw the *spirit residing*

* The (Bohemian) name of John Huss, who was burnt at the stake by the papists, a century before Luther (July 6, 1415), signifies "goose."

in the quill from it ; but he also remarked that he himself was amazed at the qualities of his quill. Very soon afterwards, it was publicly proclaimed that vast numbers of writing pens had come forth from the long quill of the monk, that all the learned men of Wittenberg eagerly seized them, expecting that they would soon acquire the length of the monk's quill, and that he and his quill would soon produce strange results. In my dream, I resolved to obtain a personal interview with the monk at the earliest opportunity, and ascertain his real intentions, but then I once more awoke and saw that daylight was appearing. I was much troubled in mind, and feel convinced that this dream, which thrice occurred to me, has a meaning. It is my purpose to lay the whole matter to-day before my confessor, but I felt anxious to communicate it previously to you, my brother. I wish you and our chancellor (Spalatin) who is here present, to give me your opinion of it.

JOHN.—Chancellor, what do you think ? We ought not, it is true to attach undue importance to dreams ; still, they should not always be lightly treated. If an intelligent, devout and inspired Joseph or Daniel were now in our midst, he might furnish the interpretation.

SPALATIN.—Your princely Grace is well aware that, according to the proverb, the "dreams of virgins, learned men and great lords, have a meaning." But what that meaning really is, time alone can unfold, when passing events furnish the solution, and enable us to say : Behold this was the meaning of the dream. Your Grace knows of such instances. Joseph declares that interpretations of dreams belong to God alone, and Daniel also says that God in heaven alone reveleth secrets. Let your princely Grace, therefore, submit this dream and its interpretation to God. As to the monk, I can only say that men of his class have often involved great lords in misfortunes ; the most favorable circumstance connected with him is this, that God appears to have commanded him to write, and that all the saints bear witness in his favor. At the same time, it is possible that, under a fair appearance, the whole is one of Satan's delusions. Your princely Grace best knows in what manner to reflect on the circumstance, in connection with devout prayer to God.

JOHN.—I fully agree with you, Chancellor. It is certainly not advisable that we should suffer ourselves to be perplexed and harassed by the dream. If it came from God, he will not withhold his gracious aid from us, but will so direct all

events, that they shall promote his glory. If it portends evil, we are, nevertheless, in the hands of God, who is able to protect us.

FRED.—May it ever be his gracious will to do this! Still, I cannot banish the dream from my mind. I have myself already attempted an interpretation of it, but *I shall withhold it from all* for the present. I propose to record the whole carefully, and *time will show* whether I have interpreted rightly. On a future occasion we will recur to this subject.

Here Spalatin's recital terminates. It may appear strange that neither he nor John should think of Luther, or of the facile interpretation of the Roman *lion* as merely the representative of *Leo X.*, the reigning pope, or, indeed, of the circumstance that Luther wielded a pen which set forth the Gospel, the "power of God." But the Reformer's first decisive step, the publication of the ninety-five theses, was only taken at the moment when the foregoing conversation occurred, and the interlocutors, who were at some distance from Wittenberg, were not aware either of Luther's intentions, or of the incalculable importance of the step which he meditated. Frederic himself, who possessed uncommon sagacity, may have possibly referred the dream to the "monk" Luther, whose remarkable character and well known religious opinions, had already made a deep impression on his mind. He was not fully satisfied that Luther's opposition to the principle on which papal indulgences were founded, was justifiable; he still respected that principle, while he had recently learned to abhor the gross abuses to which it clearly and inevitably led.

After the commotion which the publication of the ninety-five theses produced in Christendom, compelled the pope to adopt energetic measures, the Cardinals Farnese, Rafael de Rovere and Cajetan, were sent in rapid succession to Germany, with directions to allay the tumult. It seemed as if the time had come when Frederic would be absolutely compelled to abandon his neutral attitude, and either espouse Luther's cause positively, for which course the convictions of the devout but cautious prince had not yet prepared him, or else to silence him by threats and imprisonment, a step from which his sense of justice recoiled. The political aspects of the times, however, easily enabled this wise prince to maintain the attitude which he had assumed. The conflicting inter-

ests of the emperor* and the pope, placed him in a position to dictate his own terms. According to these, he pledged himself not to sustain Luther, if the latter should, after an impartial investigation, be convicted of heresy, that is, of holding unscriptural doctrines in any form; but, on the other hand, he successfully maintained the principle, that Luther should be tried in his own country, and not be conveyed as a prisoner to Rome. To this principle Frederic nobly adhered to the end.

Luther ultimately resolved, with characteristic magnanimity, to leave the electoral dominions, unwilling to involve Frederic in new embarrassments; he was ready to proceed to Paris, Nov. 25, 1518, when he received a direct command to remain. Frederic could not consent that his University should lose its brightest luminary, and the representations of the most eminent men, who sympathized with Luther, and urged the elector to retain him, at length determined Frederic to take a somewhat more decided step, and openly to avow his unalterable purpose to protect Luther, until his enemies had really convicted him of an offence. He seems to have been chiefly influenced to adopt this course by a letter of Lorenz von Bibra, bishop of Würzburg, to whom he was much attached, and who wrote: "Let not your Grace, by any means, permit that devout man, Dr. Martin Luther, to depart, for his opponents are doing him great injustice."

At a somewhat later period, Luther again expressed his willingness to leave the country, if his presence should involve the elector in serious difficulties. Spalatin shared in Frederic's apprehensions for Luther's personal safety, and could scarcely understand the heroic faith of the Reformer. The latter endeavors to dispel his fears and strengthen his faith. "I beseech you," he writes to Spalatin, "not to yield to excessive fear, nor allow human feelings to distress your heart. If I perish, nothing will be lost to the world. The interests of Wittenberg are now so well secured by the goodness of God, that I am no longer needed. Alas! I have only too much reason to fear that I am not worthy to suffer and

* Maximilian was not on friendly terms with the pope or the clergy, and, without understanding the merits of the question, by no means desired to see Luther's doctrines suppressed. "What progress is your monk making?" he once said to Frederic's counsellor, Pfeffinger, who had been sent on business to the imperial court, "his movements seem to be worthy of attention. He will play a fine game with the priests (Pfaffen)."

die in such a cause. This lot belongs to better men, not to such a miserable sinner as I am, &c." (May, 1519. de Wette's Luther's Briefe I. 260.) Frederic was now exceedingly firm in adhering to his resolution to protect Luther, until he was proved to be guilty. In a letter which he addressed, May 12, 1519, to Erasmus, he expresses the gratification which he had received from the testimonials of respect and admiration given to Luther and his movements, by very numerous learned and devout persons, both at home and in foreign lands, and then repeats the words which he often uttered: "With God's help, it shall never occur that any innocent person in our territories, should, with our consent, be surrendered to the malice of others." (Frick's Seckendorf, p. 158.)

After Frederic had thus modified his extremely reserved course of conduct, he consistently rejected all the propositions of the pope, and could not be bribed by the high honor which the pope designed to confer, by transmitting the golden rose. It was conveyed by the adroit and politic courtier, Charles von Miltitz, but could not secure the object which the pope had in view; the elector began to understand that the blessing of the pope, even when the golden rose was the medium through which it was conveyed, could not avail without the sanction of God. Political events, fully set forth on the page of history, were also occurring at this time, of which so wise a statesman as Frederic did not neglect to avail himself; they concurred in augmenting his power and influence, and, in the Providence of God, materially aided the progress of divine truth. The election of a new emperor, as successor of Maximilian, was appointed for March 17, 1519. The parties of the three candidates, Charles of Spain, Francis I., of France, and Henry VIII., of England, were lavish in promises and bribes; the intrigues of the pope, who earnestly deprecated the election of Charles, were prosecuted with the utmost address. The incorruptible Frederic, whom all the parties had approached, as the most influential member of the college of electors, and who had, with his accustomed prudence, committed himself to none, arose on the day of the election, and addressed his compeers, not one of whom could conjecture on which candidate his choice would fall. The moment for decision had arrived; the elector discussed the whole question with his usual ability, and finally announced his purpose to vote for Charles of Spain; the electors at once accepted the nomination, and Charles V. was proclaimed emperor.

Frederic, who held the office of vicar or marshal* of the empire, had administered its affairs during the interval between the death of Maximilian and the election of his successor, in accordance with the spirit which had previously guided him. The interests of the cause of evangelical religion were ably protected, and Luther's movements were free and uncontrolled. It was during this period that the celebrated disputation between Luther and Eckius occurred. The latter was the son of Michael Mayr, a petty officer in the town of Eck; such geographical names were frequently substituted, in his age, for the family name. It is said that he first introduced the name of "Lutheran," which has since become the noblest of titles, and caused it to be inserted, as a term of reproach, in the papal bull which excommunicated Luther. His disputation with the Reformer (June 27—July 15, 1519) took place at Leipzig, a city belonging to George, duke of Saxony; this prince, afterwards so hostile to Luther, concurred with him at that time, in the opinion that the abuses existing in the Romish church, loudly called for a reformation. The inability of Eckius to convict Luther of heresy, provided that the Scriptures constituted the test of sound doctrine, enabled Frederic to adhere to his well known principle, that Luther should not be delivered into the hands of the pope. His good sense relieved him soon afterwards from a painful embarrassment, when Luther published his celebrated sermon, in which he advocated the restoration of the cup to the laity, in the administration of the Eucharist. George of Saxony now openly declared that Luther, as an adherent of the Bohemian heresy, deserved to be cast off by Frederic. The latter, who does not appear to have himself fully understood the nature of the subject, was temporarily perplexed. He could not distinctly perceive the fallacy of the popish interpretation of the words of the institution, but he finally gave the following decision, which, without committing him fully, justified him in continuing to extend his protection to Luther: "If this interpretation on the part of the papal party is correct, then we, the laity, may ultimately be deprived entirely of the Lord's Supper. For, the words: *This do*,

* The Golden Bull of 1356 already recognized the right of the Duke of Saxony and the elector who ruled in the Palatinate of the Rhine (Pfalzgrafe, from Pfalzgraf, Comes Palatinus), to administer (Reichsverweserant) the affairs of the German empire during any interregnum, or when from any cause, the imperial throne was virtually vacant. Their title was usually, Reichsvicarien, Vicarii, Provisores imperii.

(1 Cor. 11: 24, 25) which they so interpret of the wine, as to refer exclusively to the apostles, and their successors, the bishops and priests, are also used in reference to the bread. If the former interpretation is correct, then the clergy may, on the same grounds, deprive us of the bread also, and we shall thus lose the whole Lord's Supper."

After the influence of Eckius had obtained the condemnatory papal bull, the pope expressly enjoined Frederic to imprison Luther, unless he would publicly recant. Duke John boldly opposed the publication of the bull, but his brother hesitated to express his will. The writings of Luther against the errors of popery had, in the meantime, assumed a still more fearless tone, until he himself proclaimed his final withdrawal from the church of Rome, by publicly burning (Dec. 10, 1520, at 9 o'clock, A. M.) the papal bull and other documents representing the genius of popery. It was this remarkable act which announced to the world that the church of Rome had now become a mere sect, that it was, in fact, as a thoroughly corrupt and heretical organization, simply and solely, the party of Antichrist, and that the Church of Christ was thenceforward represented by another communion. The responsibility of this solemn and momentous act, which Luther freely assumed, the elector would not share; he cautiously avoided any expression of his opinion of the transaction, and submitted the result to God. About the beginning of the next year, an additional papal bull appeared, in which Luther and his adherents were unconditionally excommunicated or anathematized. It was not published in Frederic's dominions; the bishops either feared the people, or were warned by the elector's counsellors, and forbidden to recognize it.

The appointed day on which the diet of Worms, since so celebrated, was to be held, drew nigh. The language which the papists employed respecting Luther and his doctrine, of which the model is already found in Acts 22: 22, was so bitter, and their misrepresentations were so vile and gross, that even Charles V. was displeased, and Frederic was forced to demand that the Reformer should be heard in his defence, not in Rome, but in Worms. He complained, in a private letter to his brother John, of the desperate conduct of the "red caps" (the cardinals), the Romans, and their whole party. The emperor at first hesitated to grant Luther an imperial safe-conduct, but even George of Saxony and the palgrave Lewis, although both inimical to him, were either too

honorable, or too solicitous for their own reputation, to support the emperor in his refusal. Frederic obtained the necessary document, but could not prevail on the imperial authorities to disown in it the well known Romish tenet: "No faith is to be kept with heretics." He received private assurances on the subject which satisfied him, to a certain extent, but the papists could not consent to renounce a principle publicly, which, unholy as it was, they often found it *convenient* to adopt in practice.

Luther was uninfluenced by the fears of his friends, who apprehended that the fate of Huss, in whose case a similar imperial safe-conduct had been violated, awaited him; the language and whole conduct of the holy man, demonstrate that God had granted him uncommon strength, suited to the uncommon trial. He reached Worms on Tuesday, April 16, 1521, and was escorted to his lodgings by an assemblage of two thousand persons; they were dust and ashes, incapable of protecting him, but he saw, like the prophet, the "horses and chariots of fire round about him." The defence which Luther made, seems to have removed the last scruples from the mind of the elector, who now received, for the first time, the full inward assurance that Luther's cause was truly the cause of God. He cautiously refrained, as usual, from expressing his opinion publicly, but on the evening of the eventful day (April 18), he could not forbear to relieve his full heart, by sending for Spalatin, and saying to him: "Dr. Luther did indeed speak well to-day, both in Latin and in German, before the emperor and all the princes. *But is he not somewhat too bold and fearless?*" His letter of April 23, to his brother John, furnishes a commentary on these words. "I would gladly sustain Luther," he says, "to the whole extent of my ability, in everything that he could reasonably expect; but, believe me, I am so vehemently assailed by the importunities of his enemies, and some of them are men *so high in rank*, that you will be astonished when I relate all to you.—May God send a happy issue! Surely, he will not abandon a righteous cause!" "Be assured," he wrote a few days afterwards, "that I have many strange things to tell you, if God permits me to see you again. Not only *Annas* and *Caiaphas*, but also *Pilate* and *Herod* are Luther's adversaries." When Frederic ascertained that Luther's life was no longer safe, he devised, with the assistance of his faithful counsellors, a plan for affording at least temporary security to the persecuted Reformer. It was decided to secrete Luther in some retreat,

with the locality of which the elector was to remain unacquainted (Guericke: *KGesch.* III. 83, on the authority of Matthesius); the arrangement was characteristic alike of the elector's determination to afford effectual protection, and of his caution in reference to himself. When Luther received a confidential communication of the measures intended to be adopted, he felt a certain degree of disappointment. He was a stranger to personal fear, and disapproved of a policy so cautious, marked by so much worldly wisdom, and well nigh indicating a distrust of God's watchful care. Still, he yielded to the wishes of the elector, and left the city at the appointed hour. The friends who accompanied him, were dismissed at a certain spot, and the vehicle in which he rode, was afterwards arrested by two knights in disguise, in whose secrecy Frederic could confide; their names appear to have been John von Prelops and Burkhard von Steinburg, but the authorities which we have consulted, vary materially in the statement of the names. These noblemen, who feigned a hostile purpose, conducted him safely to the old castle of Wartburg, in the Thuringian forest. So faithfully did the few individuals to whom the execution of the plan was confided, keep the secret, that even John, the elector's brother, and warm friend of Luther, could not ascertain from the agents the place of concealment. Luther himself was at first distressed in conscience, for having yielded to the importunities of his friends, and accused himself of having fled from danger, in place of boldly meeting it, and submitting the result to God.

Frederic's health was considerably impaired, in consequence of the trials which he endured at this exciting diet. He had at length been compelled by circumstances to decide either for or against Luther—and his decision was that of an upright, conscientious and devout man. His conduct had attracted the displeasure of Charles V., who basely forgot his obligations to "his father, the elector of Saxony," and deeply wounded his feelings. The disturbances occasioned by Thomas Münzer and his adherents, the reckless conduct of Carlstadt at Wittenberg, the anxieties occasioned by Luther's abrupt departure from his retreat in the forest, the energetic opposition of the new pope, Adrian VI., to the Lutheran cause, and the new dangers to which the interests of evangelical religion seemed to be exposed, concurred to rob the elector of all peace of mind. He could form no satisfactory opinion respecting the disorders in Wittenberg, and inquired

of Melanchthon whether the agitators assembled there, were men of God, or mere fanatics. Melanchthon declared himself unable to decide, and referred the elector to Luther. After confessing his embarrassment in a letter to Frederic, he adds: "De quibus (the true character and spirit of the fanatics) judicare præter Martinum (familiar appellation of Luther) nemo facile possit." Frederic was too conscientious to employ his civil power in silencing men whom the learned and devout Melanchthon regarded as *possibly* moved by the Spirit of God. The case is remarkable. We see here, on the one hand, the most intelligent and upright statesman of the age, and, on the other, an uncommonly able and eminent theologian, confessedly at a loss, when circumstances compel a decision under the circumstances to which the apostle alludes: "Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits," &c. 1 John 4: 1. But Luther, who was singularly endowed by his divine Master, was found equal to the emergency.—Shortly before he left Wartburg, and even before he saw the fanatics, he wrote to Melanchthon: "non probo tuam timiditatem," and in this admirable letter (de Wette, II. 124) fully expresses his views of the Zwickan prophets, their unholy rejection of Infant Baptism, &c. His own profound piety, his thorough knowledge of the Scriptures, and, in general, the wonderful spiritual gifts which the Lord had bestowed upon him, readily enabled him to detect Satan, even when he seemed to others, "transformed into an angel of light."—(2 Cor. 11: 14.) He comforted the elector in a characteristic letter, and remarked: "Your Grace long sought for relics in every land; God has now sent you (in these various difficulties), without labor or expense on your part, an entire cross, with all the nails, spears and scourges belonging to it," and then refers him to 2 Cor. 6: 4 sqq. (de Wette II. 136.) In the next letter to the elector, written on the road (March 5, 1522), after his departure from Wittenberg, he remarks, in allusion to the elector's fears for him: "I write these things that your Grace may know that I consider myself under a far more powerful protection than that which an elector could furnish; and I have no intention to solicit the protection of your Grace. Indeed, I think that I could protect your Grace more effectually, than your Grace can protect me. It is a cause in which the sword can afford no aid. It is God alone who can take care of it, without the aid of human forethought or might." (de Wette, II. 140.) The elector, who read the letter with admiration and joy, followed the advice of his

teacher, whose lofty and peculiar mission he began to comprehend more and more clearly, and sought for comfort in the daily study of the New Testament, as recently translated by Luther; to Staupitz he expressed anew his sense of the divine mercy, in giving him, through the Word, such consolation, hope and joy in God his Savior.

The emperor and the pope persevered in their persecution of the elector, and finally threatened to invade his dominions with a hostile army. Ferdinand, the emperor's brother, afforded a specimen of the spirit of the popish party, when, on hearing that his sister, Queen Isabella, had publicly adopted the Lutheran faith, he brutally said: "I would sooner have heard that my sister had perished in the sea, than that she had met with Luther in Wittenberg." The threats of the emperor and the pope (Clemens VII., successor of Adrian, who died September 14, 1523) were ineffectual; they could not induce Frederic to withhold his written protests against their persecutions of the evangelical Lutheran cause; hence they took the first decisive step which subsequently led to the organization, as a measure of self-defence, of the Protestant Church, as distinct from the antichristian church of Rome. On July 6, 1524, the articles of the Suabian Alliance were signed at Ratisbon, in the name of Ferdinand of Austria, the dukes of Bavaria, the archbishop of Salzburg, and eleven bishops. The main object of the alliance was declared to be the strict execution of the Edict of Worms (of 1521, outlawing Luther, his printers, his adherents, &c.), and consequently the complete extirpation of the Lutheran heresy. Its efforts were, however, fruitless; Frederic continued to pray, to trust in God, and to protect Luther as well as his doctrine, with undiminished vigor; and before he died, the influence of popery was forever destroyed in his dominions, even without his own direct agency.

The last days of Frederic were clouded with sorrow. Before he expired, the War of the Peasants had commenced, and he reluctantly commissioned his brother John to take up arms against them. He besought the latter to deal mercifully with the deluded people, and died before the bloody battle of Frankenhausen had occurred. The mental distress which he had for several years endured, gradually exhausted his strength; a complication of bodily diseases prostrated him entirely. A succession of fevers, and of severe attacks of colic, the gout and the stone (lithia vesicalis), had already greatly reduced him in 1519, but he subsequently seemed to

have regained his usual health. These complaints, however, recurred in the autumn of 1524 in an aggravated form, and soon after the commencement of the year 1525, his situation was deemed to be alarming in the highest degree. His language in the midst of the most acute and prolonged sufferings, manifested unshaken faith and entire submission to the divine will. His physician, Dr. Henry Stromer (also known by the geographical name of Auerbach), in vain summoned the most eminent medical men (Dr. Lindemann, &c.) to come to his aid; the resources of their science scarcely alleviated the pangs of the sufferer. On Spalatin's entrance into the chamber of the dying man, the latter extended his hand, and kindly said: "You do well in coming to me—it is a Christian duty to visit the sick." Spalatin soon afterwards proposed that he should receive the Lord's Supper; Frederic, affectionately pressing his hand, expressed his ardent desire to comply, and caused his chaplain, Wagner, to be summoned. When the body and blood of the Lord were administered, he received them with such solemnity, holy peace and gratitude to God, that none who were admitted on the occasion, could repress their tears.* After the chaplain and Spalatin had retired, he said to his attendants who remained to wait upon him, and who were deeply attached to him: "My dear children, if I have ever offended any one of your number, whether in word or in deed, I beseech you, in the name of God, to forgive me, and I further entreat you to ask others in my name, whom I may have offended, to forgive me. For we, who are rulers, are often tempted to wrong those who are subject to our authority." He wept as he spoke, and not a dry eye was seen in the chamber. When he perceived the emotion of his servants, he said: "Dear children, weep not for me—I shall not be long with you—pray to God for me." His sufferings several times extorted the words: "My children, I am very sick—I suffer much pain—O God, my God, help thou me!"† Spalatin had sent him, on that day, a letter of consolation, consisting chiefly of Scriptural passages, which he gratefully read, and directed to be laid at his side, that he might read it again. Spalatin was afterwards called

* Luther says with sincere pleasure: "Er hat das Sacrament *beider Gestalt* genommen, und keine Oelung (extreme unction omitted). Luther's Works, II. 903. Altenb. ed.

† A *post mortem* examination exposed several calculi in the kidneys and other organs; among them was one singularly jagged and sharp, nearly two inches in length.

into the chamber (on Friday, May 5, 1525, the day on which Frederic died) and once more read aloud the letter of consolation, which filled three sheets. The elector had also sent for Luther, but he was absent in Thuringia, earnestly engaged in an effort to appease the rebellious spirit of the peasants; when he arrived, the elector had ceased to breathe. On the same day Frederic proceeded, in Spalatin's presence, to dictate his last Will and Testament to his Secretary, John Veihel. It does not contain one allusion to masses for his soul, to the Virgin, to guardian angels or to the saints, all of which subjects had been introduced in a will written as late as Oct. 4, 1617, but which he subsequently destroyed. After expressing his religious sentiments, and constituting his beloved brother John his principal heir, he mentions many individuals by name, and specifies the amount of the legacies designed for them respectively, releases others from debts which they had incurred in various transactions with him, and beseeches his brother and successor to deal gently with the poor. Soon after the completion of this work, which nearly exhausted his strength, the agony which his disease occasioned, appeared to abate, and he calmly listened to the words of consolation which the faithful Spalatin continued to pronounce. At length he seemed to fall into a gentle slumber, and none were conscious that a change had occurred, until Dr. Stromer entered the chamber. He glanced at the sufferer, and immediately announced that his race was run, by pronouncing the words: *Fuit filius pacis, ideo pacifice obiit* (*he was a son of peace, therefore he has peacefully departed*). The elector died at the age of sixty-two years, three months and nineteen days, after a reign of thirty-eight years and nine months.

The body, after being embalmed, was deposited in a coffin which the deceased elector had directed to be made for himself, several years before his death. His remains were transported, a few days afterwards, to Wittenberg, from Lochan, a favorite spot, where he passed much of his time, and where he also died. He was buried with the honors due to his high rank and eminent merit; but, by the express directions of the authorities of the University, all merely popish ceremonies, usually observed on such occasions, were carefully omitted. On the evening of May 10, Melanchthon delivered a funeral discourse in the Latin language, after which Luther preached a German sermon, selecting as his text, the words in 1 Thess. 4: 13-18. On the next day, the body was low-

ered into the grave or vault prepared for it, in front of the altar of the church, and Luther delivered a second sermon on the same text.

Prof. Scheuerl of Wittenberg, one of his contemporaries, records that Frederic was tall and commanding in his appearance; he wore his hair long, but it did not conceal his lofty forehead. His countenance, although usually grave and indicative of great firmness, was marked by much gentleness of expression. Those who approached his person, while conscious that they were in the presence of a man of the highest order of intellect, were insensibly prompted to give their entire confidence to one in whose tones of voice and whole countenance, such genuine goodness of heart was distinctly revealed.

As a statesman, Frederic was regarded as the master-spirit of his age and his nation, before the ambition of Charles V. inspired him to concentrate all power in his own hands; as a sovereign, his conduct was remarkably free from those stains which the rapacity, selfishness and oppressive acts of other rulers in his day attached to their reputation. As a devout and humble Christian, he bore a noble testimony to the power of evangelical truth, and consistently adhered to his religious convictions, uninfluenced by any considerations, save those proceeding from the revealed will of God. He was not permitted to live until the Augsburg Confession was written and publicly set forth as our Confession of faith; but he had already imbibed its essential doctrines from Luther's writings, and never betrayed the cause of truth.

He was unquestionably a cautious prince—cautious, possibly, in a degree which might lead a harsh judge to suppose that his occasional irresolution or reserve betrayed traces of weakness. Seckendorf incidentally mentions the remarkable fact, in his *Introduction to his great work*,* that Luther had

* Seckendorf's words in his *Præloquium to his Commentarius hist. et apol. de Lutheranismo*, (the nineteenth page of the folio edition, Lipsiae 1694) are the following: "trepidum quippe et veluti furtivum fuit (præsidium) quod ei Fridericus Elector præstítit, cum quo ne semel quidem colloquutus est, et quem bis tantum vidit." The passage occurs on the nineteenth page of the *Vorbericht* in Frick's German translation of 1714, copies of which are frequently seen in this country. In the larger or original Latin work (folio), Seckendorf repeats the remark with sundry specifications in *Additio II.* to § 12, Lib. I. These *addenda* are not given in the German translation, which is also otherwise abbreviated. As the fact to which we refer is of considerable interest, we examined a portion of the evidence adduced by Seckendorf, and found the following passage in Luther's treatise of 1525 *Wider die himmlischen Propheten*,

labored during the eventful period extending from 1517 to 1524, (the year preceding the elector's death) without the encouragement of any earthly protector, that the elector Frederic unquestionably exhibited just and generous feelings towards him, but that Luther had never had an opportunity in his life to speak to him, and had only twice seen him! (The details we give in the note below.) This reserve was evidently designed by the elector to give his support of Luther, in the eyes of his watchful popish enemies, the character of strict impartiality. He did not, however, refuse to receive letters from Luther; de Wette has inserted thirty-two in his rich collection, (see Luther's Briefe, Vol. VI. pp. 578—580, Index, "Sachsen. A.") It was long before he was fully convinced that Luther's course was unexceptionable and righteous in the eyes of God. He secretly admired Luther's boldness, and his history does not present a single instance in which that cautiousness of character, or irresolution, as it sometimes seemed to be, or, rather, protracted deliberation previous to the formation of an unchangeable opinion, really retarded the progress of the good cause. His early habits, his constitutional gravity and reserve, the intrigues of pope and emperor, which demanded continual watchfulness, and similar causes, concurred to exhibit him as a less decided adherent of the Lutheran or evangelical doctrins, than he really was. Indeed, it seemed to be a relief to him, when Luther spoke words that truth required, and performed acts that religion demanded, which, if they had proceeded from the elector himself, would have seemed to be impolicy and rashness. God had appointed Luther to be the Reformer of the Church, and had assigned to him a field of action in which he could labor without trammels; thus it occurred that he carried on the work of God in the dominions of a prince who could not

where he is defending himself against certain aspersions of Carlstadt.—"I never in my life spoke a word," says Luther, "with the prince (Frederic), nor heard him speak, and, moreover, I never saw his face except once at Worms, when I appeared on the second day (April 18, 1521), before the emperor. It is true that I often wrote to him through Spalatin," &c. (Luther's Germ. Works, Tom. III. 49. Altenb. ed. of 1661.) Seckendorf, however, ascertained from another remark in one of Luther's writings, that the latter had, several years previously, in 1519, on one occasion *seen* the elector, without approaching his person. As this circumstance had occurred long before Carlstadt's rupture with Luther, the latter, when speaking of having only *once* seen the elector, did not use that word through mere forgetfulness, as Seckendorf supposes, but, as we are rather inclined to believe, because, on this last occasion, his accidental view of Frederic had led to no results.

venture to dictate, but was sufficiently firm to protect, as far as God was pleased to employ human agency. Frederic had now completed the work for which the Lord had raised him up, and he is dismissed at the period which we have now reached, as a good and faithful servant; another, (his brother John) possessing other qualifications, is next appointed to occupy his important post, with which, as the Reformation advanced, other and new duties were connected. The devout observer learns from the whole history of the eventful period of the Reformation, that, as a striking illustration of the ways of divine Providence, no prince was better suited for the *infancy* of the Reformation, than Frederic the Wise. "*His memory*," says Salig (Hist. d. Augs. Conf. p. 91), "*will be blessed* (Prov. 10: 7) *as long as a Lutheran Church exists on earth.*"

A succeeding number of the Evangelical Review may possibly contain a sketch of John and John Frederic, as a continuation of the above.

ARTICLE II.

LUTHER, AS A PULPIT ORATOR.

By J. G. Morris, D. D., Baltimore, Md.

IN the sixteenth century pulpit eloquence was in a deplorably low condition. Neither the interest of the hierarchy, nor the system of clerical education, which the church pursued in the middle ages, allowed any special attention to be paid to this subject. The preaching of the word, for many centuries, had not been regarded as an essential part of public worship. Forms and ceremonies were practiced, which did not require the aid of eloquence to embellish or enforce them. Preaching was not absolutely forbidden by the church, but the absence of culture among the secular clergy, and their inability to preach, exempted them from the duty, without a prohibition, and the Latin language, in which the educated clergy preached, and which the people did not understand, rendered the prohibition unnecessary. Although among the mystics of the middle ages there were some eloquent men, who preached to the people in their vernacular tongue, yet

these men were so few and isolated, that their influence cannot be taken into account. The only order which, before and at the time of the Reformation, at all practiced popular preaching, was that of the Dominicans. In churches, in market-places, and wherever an opportunity offered, they held forth to the crowd! If they had only possessed a small degree of cultivation, and had been, to the least extent, familiar with the Scriptures, there would have flowed into the people, through the multitude of dead church forms, some degree of spiritual life. But they were deplorably ignorant, and they showed an unparalleled absence of taste and tact. They attacked old heresies of which their hearers had never heard, they related fables and stories which had no moral or religious value, and really played the clown in the pulpit. When some preachers were ambitious of displaying their learning in the pulpit, they quoted passages from Aristotle. The result was, that all persons, who still retained a more refined Christian taste, were disgusted with this style of preaching, and turned away from it with loathing. Among the most distinguished of these was Erasmus. He brought down the lash of his satire unmercifully on these preachers, but neither he, with all his wit and sarcasm, nor others, who thought with him, could produce a change. It now remained for the Reformation alone to create a revolution.

Among the incomparable blessings which the Reformation brought to Christendom, was the restoration of preaching the Gospel to its true dignity, and the incorporation of it as the most important part of public worship. This produced the necessity of elevating eloquence from its deep degradation. The voice of Luther raised it from the dead. It stood forth again, strong and firm, as it had not been seen or heard since the days of the apostles, and laid hold of the hearts of the people with a force and warmth which is the admiration of all ages since. Much as Luther accomplished by his writings and personal appearance on the stage of action, his popular eloquence was one of the principal weapons of his victorious warfare.

Our design is to paint a rhetorical picture of the great Reformation here—to show, not the writer, the theologian, the polemic, the poet, but the popular preacher—the mode of his training, and its overwhelming results.

His Oratorical Training. At Erfurt, Luther devoted himself with untiring diligence to classic studies of antiquity. He read the great Latin masters with studious atten-

tion, and as he had a most retentive memory, everything he read and heard was constantly present to his mind.

Often in his writings, does he express himself on the value of these studies, and warmly recommends the diligent pursuit of them. He eulogizes Cicero as one of the most distinguished men that ever lived; he praises in extravagant terms most of the poets, moralists and orators, and had made himself so familiar with the writings of some of them, as to be able to recite long passages at will.

Now, although Luther was not an imitator of the ancients, in the structure of his language and style of speech, and did not design to model himself after any of the orators of antiquity, yet it cannot be denied that he adopted many of their rules. He practiced verbal and written expression agreeably to their directions, and this he could the more easily do, because he was so perfectly familiar with them.

Who does not admire in Luther, that *simplicity* with which the ancients clothed their subjects? Who misses in Luther that large comprehensiveness which distinguished those men of old? They had nothing far-fetched, to create an effect; no false pathos to excite emotion; no highly colored and variegated picture to deceive the senses, but depended solely on the truth of their positions for effect; and who that knows Luther, will not acknowledge that all this is true of him? It is not to be denied that he owes much to his study of the writings of Augustine, but the rules of the ancients were more important to him than those of the Bishop of Hippo. It is also true, that many expressions of Luther in his sermons, do not exactly accord with a cultivated taste, but we must set this down to the credit of a coarse age, in which much that is grating now to a refined ear, was not so then, and to the heat and excitement of the battle, in which men did not weigh their words. If these coarse peculiarities are overlooked, we shall find in every sermon, evidences of a truly cultivated taste, and much that will answer for a model to all future ages.

The indebtedness of Luther to the ancient languages, for the improvement and refinement of his own native tongue, was manifestly great, and proudly acknowledged by him. Every scholar is aware of the barbarisms which characterized the German language in the sixteenth century. Its words were rough, and the style of the few writers who employed it, was inelegant and uncouth. The educated classes spoke, wrote and thought in Latin. The language of the church

service was Latin, so that there was no opportunity for the improvement of the vernacular among the common people. Luther determined to re-instate the religious element to its legitimate rights, by emancipating the mother tongue from its bondage to a foreign language, and thus infuse new life into the community. Although he had, at first, written and preached in Latin himself, yet as soon as he had commenced his great work of reformation, he accommodated himself to the understanding of the people. He made a beginning by the exposition of the seven penitential Psalms in the German language, and afterwards boldly advanced further. His familiarity with ancient classic literature, aided him essentially in the improvement and refinement of the language. The elegantly constructed sentences, the impressive rounded periods, the rich profusion of synonyms, the correct use of individual words, the harmony of style and flowing melody of the ancient writers, all contributed to the improvement of his native tongue. Models like these deeply influenced a mind like his, as we everywhere observe the effect in his own writings.

His defence of the study of ancient literature, which is found in his works, Walch ed. X. 545, V. 1256, is a masterpiece of argument, wit and withering sarcasm.

His *philosophical* studies contributed materially to the formation of his character as a preacher. The scholastic philosophy governed the church and the scientific world, during the middle ages. It developed precision of thought, closeness of logical deduction, and cherished a boldness of speculation which shrank from the investigation of no problem, however obscure or difficult. But it degenerated into refined subtleties, hair-splitting distinctions, absurd strifes of words, and casuistical questions without intelligible decisions, which froze the life out of warm and generous thought, and totally contradicted the spirit of Christianity. Luther aimed a powerful blow at the whole system, but only after he had made himself familiar with it, and could form an intelligent opinion of it. But he derived these advantages from this pursuit. The disputationes which at that time were practiced in the Universities, and which were mostly confined to philosophico-theological subjects, contributed to the exercise of logical thinking and improvement in rhetoric. Luther diligently studied Aristotle, and made himself familiar with the systems of the old philosophers. By this means, he acquired an extraordinary dexterity in discriminating subtle questions, solid compactness of expression, facility in skeletonizing a dis-

course, of looking a subject into shape, and treating its different divisions. He also acquired the difficult art of subordinating his feelings to his judgment, the skill of handling a subject without prepossession, of weighing the opinions of others with candor, and of refuting them with fairness and force. He was no enemy of philosophy. He pays high encomiums to logic and the cognate studies, and no man was ever more indebted to them for the distinctness of his ideas and the power of his arguments. He never would have attained that transparent clearness in the statement of religious themes, and that comprehensive and impressive discussion and defence of them, without his profound acquaintance with philosophy. It furnished him with strong weapons in his polemical writings.

His *historical* studies were extensive and profound. He himself tells us, that nearly all wholesome laws, ennobling acts, good counsels, solemn warnings, awful threatenings, solid comforts, sound instruction, useful wisdom, happy precaution, together with all other virtues, flow from history as a living fountain. It teaches how God preserves, governs, punishes and blesses the world. His whole reformation work—all his assaults on the errors of the times, and all the developments founded on the Scriptures, he first weighed in the scale of history. He made himself master of political, biblical and ecclesiastical history. His rich attainments in this science are scattered over all his works. They enabled him to illustrate, embellish and enforce his writings and sermons.

His familiarity with the *church fathers* contributed immeasurably to his qualifications as a preacher. His favorite author was, of course, Augustine. "Next to the Bible I prefer him as my master. I have lost many hours over Jerome, Chrysostom and others, which I had better devoted to Augustine. If you do not trust to my experience, try it for yourself." But he was not blindly devoted to his favorite. He often dared to differ from him.

Their influence on him, however, was strong. He was particularly benefitted by them in his apologetical writings. They were the heroes of the church in his defence against heathenism and heresy, and he whose conflict with church abuses, in his own day, was not less important and fierce, learned much from their example and their mode of warfare.

But it was the *study of the Scriptures* which, above all, qualified Luther for his unparalleled pulpit eloquence. The whole world knows with what ardor he entered on this pur-

suit, with what untiring energy he prosecuted it to the end of his life, and how much he thereby contributed to the improvement of the times. His voluminous expositions of the different books of the Bible, his frequent quotation of passages in his sermons and lesser writings, his admirable adaptation of them to the common events of life, his profound acquaintance with the whole system of inspired truth, all demonstrate that in this more essential qualification for the preacher, he was perfect.

This, then, was, in brief, what may be called the scientific or intellectual armor of Luther, by the peaceful use of which he did such efficient battle for the Lord in the pulpit.

But this was not all. His *moral* qualifications were not less complete. Quintilian had, long before Luther, told us that an orator must be a good and upright man (*vir bonus*) ; as Seneca has declared that no man deserves less merit than he who himself lives differently from what he teaches others (*qui aliter vivit et aliter vivendum esse praecepit*). The first qualification of a Christian preacher is, that he be thoroughly penetrated with a true Christian spirit. If this does not pervade his sermons, he may explain the faith most eloquently, and attract applause by the force of his argumentation, but lasting impressions on the minds of his hearers, he cannot expect. This truly Christian spirit filled the soul of Luther. His bitterest enemies could not justly charge him with immorality. The purest motives animated his great heart, the severest scrutiny of himself and the most faithful devotedness to his vocation, characterized him through every stage of his eventful life. He cheerfully follows his exalted destiny, and acknowledges that he was selected to perform an extraordinary work, and rejoices in what the Lord had accomplished through his agency, but prudence never forsakes him ; he never impatiently hurries on his work, as though he would outstrip Providence, and never, discouraged by hindrances, does he take his hand from the plough ; his enthusiasm was tempered by a well balanced mind, and he never forgot his own imperfections when favored with the most manifest signs of the divine approbation. Though tempted to pride because of his extraordinary success, yet he was always humble ; though fired with a Christian heroism never surpassed, yet he was always afraid of offending God. He loved peace, yet he was a bold warrior ; he was always ready for reconciliation, yet he would not compromise his cause one

iota. Far removed from love of ease, he persevered with astonishing industry in his labors, amid the most furious attacks from without, and mental conflicts from within; he never transferred to the shoulders of others, what he could bear himself; he asked no sacrifice from his friends, which it was in his own power to make. He candidly acknowledged merit in his friends whenever deserved, and envy was a stranger to his bosom. His enemies had in him an honorable opponent, who despised all subterfuges and stratagies, and who met them fairly on the field of battle. Personal attacks on himself he disregarded, but assaults on his cause he hurls back with terrible violence. Publicly and privately he was the same honest, candid, humble, godly man. Christ was to him all and in all. This was the great central point of his faith, and with what power he developed and illustrated it, all his writings copiously show.

With this exalted religious and moral character, there were associated other spiritual qualifications, necessary to every preacher.

His *zeal* was remarkable. By this we understand the fervor with which the mind of the preacher has grasped, and seeks to present a subject which he designs to impress on his hearers. No man can be an effective preacher without it. The most genial apprehension of a subject, the most copious and striking richness of thought, and the clearest argumentation, are no substitute for it. Where feeling, warmth and energy are wanting, the object of the preacher is not accomplished. What the ancients called *animos movere*, can only be effected by fervor and genuine animation. That rhetorical zeal is false, which seeks only to excite the passions, without directing and controlling them; that, on the other hand, is genuine, which aims at the subordination of the passions to the truth. It seeks to move the mind, but only to win it for Christ; to infuse a wholesome warmth into the hearer, and not to disturb the harmony of his soul by tumultuous excitement, which unfits it for reflection, and degenerates into fanaticism. The zeal of the preacher must be directed towards edification, and if he is not capable of this, he had better keep silence in the assembly of the saints.

Luther, with his choleric temperament, was not inclined to intemperate zeal, and has given divers exhibitions of it in his polemical writings, but never in his sermons. He exercised complete control over his passionate feelings in the pulpit, and herein displayed his extraordinary wisdom. He avoided all

unworthy rhetorical arts, which so easily rouse the shallow emotions of the crowd; he never availed himself of their weak side to gain their convictions; he never flattered them with hopes of an improvement in their worldly affairs, and never made promises which pleased the flesh. His only design was to promote their spiritual welfare, and to emancipate their souls from the fetters which bound them. He despised the efforts of such men as Munzer and Carlstadt, to make themselves popular orators by flattering the crowd and rousing their passions; he did not regard the tumultuous applause of the multitude which greeted them, as the genuine sentiment of the people, knowing full well that they who applauded to-day, would cry crucify him, to-morrow. Through this prudence, which tempered his holy fervor, he succeeded in securing for his cause the popular element of the nation, and with its help, carried on his glorious work.

With this holy zeal there was associated a paternal *tenderness of heart*. He was a man of the finest and most amiable sensibilities. This is manifested in his sermons, not by any attempt to produce evanescent excitement, to wring tears from the eyes of his hearers, or occasion sluggish sadness, by which the power of faith is weakened, but in the desire apparent in all his preaching, to help his brethren in the deep impressiveness of his admonitions, in the self-sacrificing spirit with which he defends the Gospel, in the firmness with which he plants himself on the basis of salvation, in the intimate knowledge of all the workings of the human heart, which he so dexterously brings to light. His hearers know that he seeks not his own, but the things of Christ, and they know that at the risk of his life, he preaches these truths, and hence he gains their confidence, and he knows how to use it. He speaks as a father to his children, or a friend to his friends; he does not feel elated at his success, or elevated above them, but treats the lowest as a brother, for whom Christ has died, and who is to be won for Christ.

His *candor* was a beautiful trait of his character as a preacher. No man found it necessary to inquire more than once as to what Luther believed. The hearing of one sermon made it evident. The whole heart was laid open, and there was no suspicion that something was kept behind. When we consider how the people were accustomed to discover scarcely anything but deception, craft, and hypocrisy in the clergy of that day, and to look with mistrust on all church institutions, we can easily conceive the transparency and honesty which

characterized Luther, who so soon won the confidence of the people, though he had but recently come out of a cloister, and wore the garb of a priest. They saw that the man was honest; they felt that he was sincere. It was evident that he had no selfish purpose to subserve, and he gained their hearts by opening his own. He employed no trick—he concealed no truth—he practiced no duplicity.

We are now ready to concede that he was eminently *unassuming* and *disinterested*. If Luther had been ambitious of wealth or worldly honor, he could have acquired rich stores of both from friends and foes. The former were ready to bestow on him every distinction an ambitious heart could covet, and the latter approached him with offers and bribes of the most tempting character. But he would not be bought. Though he was aware of his unparalleled popularity among the people; though he was conscious of having performed a work for which posterity, to the latest generation, would hold his name in grateful remembrance—though he could boast of having sacrificed all the powers of body and soul to his work, yet he has displayed a modesty that is the admiration of all ages of the world. No hierarchical spirit dwelt in him. Whilst he bravely fought the battles of the Lord, and was regarded as the most mighty hero of the Gospel army, in his own estimation he was the least important and most unworthy soldier in the camp of Israel. Hence we never hear any complaints that his services were not rightly appreciated.—And for the very reason, that he never aimed at his own advantage, he could regard the heavy burdens he was compelled to bear, as the burden of the cross, whilst the selfish man is tormented with vexatious disappointments, and murmurs against Providence for not granting success to his ambitious schemes.

His *boldness* in maintaining the truth, was a distinguishing trait of his character. He never feared the face of man. He courted no smiles; he quailed not before frowns. Error was laid bare without reference to persons, and immorality was reproved, by whomever practiced. Boldness, however, ceases to be a virtue in the preacher, and degenerates into presumptuous coarseness, when it is not controlled by justice and discretion. The sacred orator, conscious of the high interests entrusted to him, must not shrink from frankly exposing everything which would compromise the truth, or retard the progress of Christianity. But fidelity to the cause of the Gospel, does not require him to be harsh in his rebukes of

particular individuals, for his personal allusions will, in most instances, rather offend than convince. His discourses will excite displeasure, and be unprofitable. Rich in experience, accomplished in education, impartial in judgment, untaught in the fear or favor of men, disinterested and sincere, he must hold forth the unvarnished truth. In these excellencies Luther was great—almost unequalled. With giant hands he tore off the covering which hypocrisy, ambition and avarice had thrown over sacred things, and exhibited the monstrous delusion to the world. The sins and immoralities of his times, he exposed unsparingly, whether practiced by the high or low, but the persons of men he always respected, and gave no unnecessary offence.

The extraordinary success of Luther's preaching was owing in a great measure, to its singular adaptation to the *popular* comprehension and wants. It was the exact opposite of that subtle scholasticism which, with few exceptions, characterized the preaching of that day. It partook in no degree of the coarse vulgarity and ridiculous harlequinade of the preaching of the mendicant monks and indulgence pedlers. We know no pulpit orator since his day, not even excepting Spener, who so dexterously struck the popular chord as Luther; no one who so ingeniously adapted the presentation of his subject, and so forcibly impressed it on the popular mind. We in vain look in his sermons for those elegant blandishments of rhetoric, and those smooth platitudes which distinguish modern pulpit eloquence. He practiced no accommodation of the truth to sensitive hearts; he was not too refined to employ figures of speech drawn from popular language, modes of thought, feelings and habits, in order to illustrate and enforce the Gospel; he did not preach only for the benefit of the cultivated classes, and rise far above the comprehension of the crowd; he was not one-sided or partial, nor ambitious of applause, but free, full, faithful and powerful. What he had to say, he said with all his heart, without reference to the class of his hearers, for he spoke to the congregation of the Lord, in which all are one in Christ. He did not pursue any special party interest, but the great cause of truth. He spoke only of truths which no one can dispense with, who seeks the salvation of his soul.

Although Luther had, among his hearers, the most learned and cultivated men of his day, yet he did not accommodate himself to their refined tastes and scholastic acquirements, but always suited himself to the comprehension of the hum-

bler classes. His observations on this tendency in preachers, are familiar to those who are in the least degree acquainted with his writings, but which we have not room here to quote. Though Luther never wrote a system of Homiletics, yet he has, throughout his writings, and in his recorded conversations, uttered so many admirable rules, that some ardent admirers of his have collected and systematized them in regular order. Thus, also, a regular system of divinity has been gathered from his numerous works, and the study of both would vastly improve even the preaching of the present day, for there are many who believe that, with all its refinements, it is still capable of improvement.

ARTICLE III.

SCHMID'S DOGMATIK OF THE LUTHERAN CHURCH.

The following article is a translation from the valuable dogmatik of Dr. H. Schmid, of the University of Erlangen. For an extended notice of the author and the work, the reader is referred to the first volume of the Review. Instead of giving a free translation, which would have been more attractive to the general reader, but less accurate, the translator has adhered as closely to the text as the nature of the languages involved would permit, so that he might, if possible, give in another language, the *ipissima verba* of the author. He has translated part second, concerning man. This is divided into the state of integrity and the state of corruption. The former is inserted in this number, to be followed, from time to time, by the remainder.

Independently of the intrinsic excellence of the work, as setting forth the doctrinal views of the church in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the present condition of the church makes it proper to direct the attention of our ministers and laymen to the standard theological works of our church. This condition of the church may be expressed as, first, a state of unacquaintedness with the master minds referred to chiefly on account of the paucity of copies of their works in this country, and also, in part, of the languages in which they were written. Second, on account of the prejudices which have been awakened against them, and the misrepresentation of their views; so that all may have an opportunity of judging for themselves. Third, to inform other denominations, who seem to be profoundly ignorant of the doctrines, as well as of the theological writers of the church, and some of them even of the existence of

the church itself. Fourth, to preserve our church, if possible, from Popery and Puritanism, from symbolism and *simplicity*, and from supralapsarian Calvinism and bald Arminianism, from the name as well as the thing. We venture to assert that the Protestant church of the first two centuries could not have left, humanly speaking, a richer legacy to posterity, than the learning and piety, and genius and industry which are embodied in the works to which Schmid refers, and which he quotes. They were giants who wrote them, which the efforts of modern writers may strive to imitate, but can never equal.

PART. II.—OF MAN.

Sec. 23. Inasmuch as the discussion, in the first part, was of God in general, and of the works which he had made, so the second part treats of man, for whose sake the world was created and the revelation was given; but especially of the condition in which man now is, and which makes him need redemption. (1). This his present moral condition cannot, however, be described, before we explain how he attained it, for it is not the condition in which man was originally created. First, then, we must discuss man's original condition: then the condition in which he now is. (2). The second part, therefore, divides itself into these two parts: I.—*Of the state of integrity.* II.—*Of the state of corruption.*

CHAP. I.—OF THE STATE OF INTEGRITY.

Sec. 24. “*The state of integrity is the first condition of man, created according to the image of God, in goodness and rectitude.*”—Quenstedt. Thus the first condition of man is called, when as yet he was entirely unhurt, and incorrupt in all his endowments, powers and attributes. (3). This condition is more specifically described by the expression: “*The image of God in which man was created*” (Gen. 1: 26, 27, v. 1), for man is distinguished from all the other creatures in this, that he was made in the image of God. (4). This expression denotes, in general, a resemblance to God, which has its foundation in this, that God made himself, as it were, a pattern and archetype, according to which he created man. (5). The passages, Col. 3: 10, Eph. 4: 24, (6) teach in what particulars the resemblance to God consists, by which his original condition is described. In these, the Apostle states, that mankind, concerning whom he takes for granted that they had lost the image of God, must be renewed again in the same; and inasmuch as he describes the new condition,

as that in which mankind are renewed by the power of the Holy Ghost, in true righteousness and holiness, we see that he means by the image of God (Gen. 1 and 5), the especial spiritual and moral perfection of man's original condition. (7). Quenstedt. "The image of God is a natural perfection, consisting in an entire conformity with the wisdom, justice, immortality and majesty of God, which was divinely created in the first man, in order that he might perfectly know, love and glorify God, his creator." (8). According to this, man in his original condition possessed:

1.) Wisdom and the power to understand perfectly, according to the measure of his necessities, things divine, human and natural. (9).

2.) Holiness and freedom of the will, according to which man loved God and that which is good, and possessed the power to live in conformity with the entire will of God. (10).

3.) Purity of the natural affections, and the perfect harmony of all his powers and inclinations. (11.) Hollaz. "The perfections constituting the image of God, were an intellect excelling in knowledge, perfect holiness, freedom of the will, unspotted purity of the sensuous appetites, and the most delightful agreement of the affections with the dictates of the intellect and government of the will, and conformable to the wisdom, holiness and purity of God, as far as was consistent with the capacity of the first man."

These spiritual and moral excellences, thus described, are the true reason why man is called the image of God (12); They are also summed up in the expression, "original righteousness." (13). With these there are yet connected, and as a natural consequence from them, corporeal excellences, and a peculiarly exalted position in relation to the external world. (14) viz., a body immortal, and incapable of suffering; for neither pain nor death could touch man thus spiritually and morally endowed; and dominion over the other animals (Gen. 1: 26-28) for in this also does the exalted dignity of the likeness of God manifest itself. Hollaz. "The less principal perfections, by which the image of God is made up, are a body, infected with no stain of sin, free from corrupt passions, immortal, and possessing the full power of ruling sublunary creatures, especially beasts." (15). According to this constitution, it could not be otherwise, than that man would rejoice in uninterrupted happiness, to which also his residence in Paradise, "a most pleasant habitation," contributed its share. (16).

All these excellences we must point out as natural to man, not indeed in the sense, that if he lost them he would no longer be the same being, but yet in this sense, that they cannot be separated from him, without making his whole condition different from what it formerly was. This is expressed in the statement, that the image of God is a natural perfection, and not an external, supernatural, and accidental gift. (17). This condition, with all its excellences, man would also have propagated to his posterity (by natural generation, Gen. 5: 3; Rom. 5: 12) had he not fallen. Do we inquire concerning supernatural gifts, of which man, in his original condition, was a partaker? These can be more easily enumerated, viz: "The supernatural favor of God, the gracious indwelling of the most holy trinity, and the enjoyment thence derived," for these gifts are to be regarded, in a certain sense, as especial additions and consequences, flowing from man's happy and morally good condition. (18).

NOTES TO PART II.—SEC. 23 & 24.

(1.) *Quenstedt*.—The subject of Theology is man, who fell into misery from his original happy state, and who is to be brought back to God and eternal salvation. The discussion here is not of man as to his essence, and as he is a creature, but as he is such or such a creature, and in regard to his state, which before the fall was innocent and most happy, but after the fall corrupt and most miserable.

(2.) *Hollaz*.—Concerning the fall of man, the condition from which, (*terminus a quo*) as well as the condition into which he fell, (*terminus ad quem*) is to be considered. The condition from which he fell, is the state of innocence or integrity. The misery of fallen man cannot be accurately estimated, unless the happiness which preceded it, and of which man, alienated from God, deprived himself, can be exactly estimated. For the loss of anything is understood from previous possession of it, and the magnitude of an evil is estimated by the good which has been lost. The various conditions of man, Calov, enumerates in the following order: The states of man, which come to be considered in theology, are diverse. One before the fall, which is called the state of innocence: one after the fall, which again is divided into a state of sin without grace, which they call a state of sin or corruption; and a state of sin under grace, caused by a gracious

renovation commenced in this life, and completed in the next: whence the state of grace in this life is called the state of renovation, to which the state of glory succeeds in another life. Moreover, although God desires the renovation of all men, and the sacred Scriptures and theology have been directed to this point, yet many are not renewed, who consequently, after this life, are compelled to undergo another state, viz: that of eternal condemnation. Thus, if all the conditions of man are to be regarded, five states may be assigned to him, viz: of nature innocent, corrupt, renewed, glorified and condemned; or a state of innocence, of misery, of grace, of eternal glory, and of eternal shame. The papists err, who invent yet another state, which they call that of the (*purorum naturalium*) purely natural, which is nothing more than a mere figment of the scholastics, since, indeed, a man never did exist, nor could exist, with the simple negation both of innocence and grace, of sin and misery, who was neither just nor unjust, and who neither pleased nor offended God. In the topic which is under discussion by us, only the first two states are considered, for the subject of theology is only man in a state of sin, who is to be restored to salvation.

(3.) *Calov*.—It is called a state of integrity, because man in it was upright and uncorrupt (Eccl. 7: 30) in intellect, will, the corporeal affections and endowments, and in all things was perfect. They call it also the state of innocence, because he was innocent and holy, free from sin and pollution.

(4.) *Baier*.—It is evident that there are other creatures, which are called very good, and though created according to a certain form agreeably to the divine intellect, yet not in the image of God.

(5.) *Hollaz*.—The formal requisites of an image, generically considered, are, 1) resemblance or agreement with the reality or prototype; because it is the property of an image to represent that of which it is an image. But this cannot be done without resemblance; 2) origin or the procession of the image from the reality, because the image was made to imitate the prototype, for the sake of representing it. The difference, according to Hollaz, between a vestige (*vestigium*) and an image, is expressed in the following manner: An image clearly represents that of which it is an image; a vestige obscurely points to that of which it is a vestige. In all creatures are seen the vestiges of divine power, wisdom and goodness; but in unfallen man the image of God shone forth with full splendor. Yet remarks Baier, concerning this gen-

eral definition of image; the image of God in man ought not, or cannot be referred to all things which are in God; nor is it in man in the same degree of perfection in which it is in God. The expression image is found in Gen. 1: 26. Concerning the meaning of the words *מְלֵאָה* and *מְלֵאָה* Hollaz says, "In the original (Gen. 1: 26) two words, *מְלֵאָה* image, and *מְלֵאָה* likeness, not that they are expressions for different things and that image denotes the very substance of the human soul and likeness its accidental perfections or attributes (as some of the papists say), but that the latter may be exegetical of the former, and that image may be designated as most like or very similar.

(6.) It is well known that the expression image of God is employed in a variety of significations, and therefore we must ascertain from other passages, in what respect man can be said to be like God. In the following passages, Calovius furnishes the proper rule, according to which we can discover the resemblance which we are considering. "Inasmuch as the conformity of man to God, as to an archetype, is found to be manifold, and in respect to this conformity, the image of God is variously defined by different persons, the following rule should be particularly observed, lest we should here depart from the proper sense of the scriptures: *That conformity of man to God, belongs to the image of God, which was impressed upon our first parents in creation, the greatest part of which was lost by transgression, and which, in this life, must be restored to new existence, by renovation through the blessed work of regeneration.*" This rule is based upon the passages, Col. 3, and Eph. 4, from which we learn, that the likeness to God, which we are here discussing, must consist of spiritual and moral attributes. Therefore the image of God, which is ascribed to man in his original state, is described as accidental" (by which is meant that which may be changed or lost) the accidental perfections of which image are conformed to the infinite perfections of God, according to the measure of human capability." Hollaz. Through this definition the *accidental* image of God is distinguished, 1) from the *substantial* image of God, which Christ is, according to 2 Cor. 4: 4; Col. 1: 5; Hebrews 1: 3, and by which the sameness of the substance (wesen) of the Father and the Son is pointed out. Hollaz. The *substantial* image (of God) is the eternal Son of God, because he exhibits in himself the entire essence of the father, being distinguished from him by the mode of his substance; 2) this definition shows that the advantages of

man's original condition, whether of the body or of the soul, do not make up his being itself, but that they consist of attributes which are, indeed, intimately united with it, but yet, when they are removed, the being of man remains unaltered. According to the position above assumed, Calovius proceeds: "Whence it is clear that the conformity (to God) which is found in the substance of the soul, or of the body, does not belong to the image of God, which is described in the language of the scriptures, because the substance of the soul, or of the body was not destroyed by the fall; neither is it restored by renovation." Quenstedt. "We must distinguish between the substance of man, or the matter itself of which he is composed, and that which, as if something following, adheres most closely to the substance of man, and nevertheless, as to its accidents, perfects it internally: or we must distinguish between nature itself, and its qualities, or perfections by means of qualities: the image of God indicates the latter, not the former. In few words, that image of God is not man, but in man, i. e., it is not substantial or essential to man, but accidental. In opposition to the views of the Flacciani (followers of Flaccius), who maintain that the image of God was the substantial form itself of the first man, and the very essence of the rational soul, which was entirely lost in the fall of Adam."

A distinction is also made in the "accidental" image of God, viz: viewed as *general* and susceptible of perversion (abusive) and as *special* and proper. In the first sense, the resemblance of man (to God) is spoken of on account of a certain general analogy or agreement with God. (Hollaz.) "The substance itself, of the human soul, exhibits certain things that are divine, and stands related to the Divinity as to an exemplar. For God is a spirit, immaterial, intelligent, acting with a free will, &c., &c., which being predicated of the human soul, can, in a certain measure, be affirmed of it. In this sense, however, man did not lose it through the fall, and therefore it can be affirmed of him also after the fall: Gen. 9: 6; James 3: 9. Only in the last sense is the resemblance in the state of uprightness discussed. (Quenstedt.) The image of God (viewed as special) is not to be sought for in those things which yet remain in man after the fall, and which are truly in man unrenewed. Because the image of God having been lost by the disobedience of the first Adam, must be restored by a new creation, through the obedience of the second Adam. Consequently, in the particulars dis-

cussed by us, we understand by the image of God only those gifts and graces granted to man in his first creation, and lost by the fall, (i. e.) the integrity and rectitude of all the powers concreted with the just man.

(7.) *Gerhard.*—In the following expressions (Col. 3, Eph. 4) the meaning is the same: "In the image of God, and like God." There is exhibited in these a description of the new man, who is called new, not by reason of a change of essence, but on account of new qualities, the knowledge of God, justice and true holiness. "The image of God consists in that in respect of which man was made like God, and is renewed in the image of God: But he is renewed in respect of the knowledge of God, justice, and holiness, &c., &c., and in these particulars he is made like God, in the image of God. Therefore, the primeval image of God in man, consists of these things."

(8.) *Baier.*—The divine image, in the *special* acceptation of the term, implies certain accidental perfections, created in the intellect and will of the first pair, conformable to the perfections which are in God, and bestowed upon men for the purpose of directing aright, and perfecting their actions, in order to obtain the great end.

Gerhard.—This is the description of the image of God in the first man, to be sought for in the scriptures; "that which is justice and true holiness," by which is meant the highest rectitude, integrity, and conformity with the divine law, of all the powers of body and soul, the highest perfection, innocence and purity of the whole man, which his nakedness and his dwelling in paradise prove.

(9.) *Baier.*—In respect of intellect, God bestowed upon the first pair, in imitation of himself, as of an exemplar, a certain wisdom (i. e.) a certain habitual enlightenment or perfection of intellect, so that they attained a high degree of knowledge in things divine, human and natural, and that which was sufficient for their primeval state. The proof of this, according to Quenstedt, appears, 1) from Col. 3: 9, 10; 2) from the acts of Adam, which are: *a*) an appropriate application of names, Gen. 2: 19, which was not only grammatical as to the nomenclature of the animals, but even highly logical as to the most correct definition; *b*) the knowledge which he possessed of Eve, Gen. 2: 23; *c*) prophecy, or a prediction concerning the perpetuity of the conjugal relation, Gen. 2: 24.

The nature and extent of this wisdom are more particularly defined in the following: Behr. "So that the intellect of man might understand the essence and will of God, in so far as it was necessary to attain this end, viz: that the intellect might point out the worship appropriate to God, or how to live in a just and holy manner."

Quenstedt.—"This knowledge of Adam was excellent, full, perfect and complete, such as no man since the fall could acquire, either from the volume of nature or of inspiration. When, therefore, the inquiry is made, whether the intellect of the Apostles, after the reception of the Holy Ghost, was superior to that of Adam before the fall? the reply is, we must distinguish between the knowledge of divine things and the mysteries of faith, and the perfect and complete knowledge of all things natural and useful to man. In reference to the former, we can believe that the Apostles possessed greater knowledge than Adam, because, after the advent of Christ, these things were known more fully and distinctly than before. In reference to the latter, Adam excelled all men, and therefore also the Apostles, both in the extent or amplitude, as well as the degree or measure of knowledge, and that too, derived, not from probable reason or consequences, but from the proper causes of each thing, and also by the tenacity and unchangeableness of his knowledge. Hence it is evident that the knowledge of Adam was limited, because he knew not the secret decrees of God, nor the thoughts of the heart, nor future contingencies, nor the number of the stars. This knowledge also, which was concreate with Adam, could have been perfected more and more, and admitted of augmentation, if you regard the perfection of the degree of knowledge, both by revelation, or a more extended knowledge of God in supernatural things, as also by experience and observation in things natural."

Hollaz.—"The knowledge of Adam was truly excellent, and sufficient for his primeval state: but it was not the intuitive knowledge of God. For the clear vision of God is not given on earth, but is promised to be given in heaven." 1 Cor. 13: 12; 1 John 3: 2.

(10.) *Baier.*—"In regard to the will, spiritual strength was bestowed by God upon man, or an habitual inclination and prompting to love God above all things, and to do all things according to the direction of an intellect rightly illuminated: but to avoid what it decided should be avoided;

and to govern the lower powers of his nature, lest they should break forth into inordinate and sinful acts.

Quenstedt.—“The perfection of the will of the first man, therefore, consisted, 1) in a natural inclination to that which is good, which altogether excluded every proximate power of erring; 2) in a free and unhindered volition of good, and the execution of that volition, and thus there was in him a holy freedom of the will, and a free holiness, which excluded all sin. Thus free was his will, that it inclined only to good, and was not prone to the choice of evil, or the neglect of good; whatever occurred afterwards, happened through an unfortunate abuse of the freedom of the will. But holiness in the first man did not introduce absolute impeccability, but yet in some respects a freedom from sin in his will.

(11.) *Hollaz.*—There were in the first man the most exact harmony and wonderful agreement of all the higher and lower powers of his nature. For reason most promptly obeyed the divine law, the will reason, the sensuous appetite the will, the affections the appetite, and the members of the body the affections.

Baier.—For this reason it is, that our first parents, in the state of integrity, knew not that they were naked, neither blushed, because their sensuous appetites (although an object were present which could entice them) were not influenced, even in the least degree, by any inordinate affection. Gen. 2: 25.

(12.) *Baier.*—This wisdom, righteousness and holiness of the first pair, thus engross the idea of the divine image, that it is they only from which man, speaking in the abstract, (absolute) can be called the image of God.

(13.) The expression, “*original righteousness*,” was more frequently employed, in the earliest systems of divinity, to point out man’s original condition. Apology to Confession, 1: 17; “original righteousness implies, not only an equable temperament of the bodily qualities, but also these gifts, viz: a more certain knowledge of God, fear of God, confidence in God, or a certain rectitude or power of attaining them. And this is proved by the Scriptures, when they say (Gen. 1: 27), that man was made in the image and likeness of God, which is nothing else than this wisdom and righteousness embodied, so that he might know God, and that in them God might be manifest (he) these gifts were bestowed upon man, viz: the knowledge of God, the fear of God, confidence in God, and like blessings. Paul also (Col. 3, Eph. 4) shows that the im-

age of God consists in the knowledge of God, justice and truth.

Chemnitz.—“*Original righteousness* was not only the receiving, but also the rectitude and soundness of all the powers of man. *Original righteousness* consisted, not only in an equable temperament of the body, but especially in the rectitude of the powers of the soul. *Original righteousness* comprehended, not only the second table of the law, but also the first. Nor was it connected only with external actions, or the inferior powers of man.” This is, in fact, all that the earliest divines say concerning *the state of integrity*. The view which has been given in the text, belongs to a later period.

Concerning *original righteousness*, Calovius remarks in addition: “It is called *righteousness*, not as this virtue is distinguished from others, which then is called *particular righteousness*, but as *general righteousness*, in the common acceptation, which, however, is here understood in a higher sense, comprehending not only all moral, but also spiritual virtues, not merely those which relate to the will, but those also which have respect to the intellectual powers, because by this term is now meant, according to the use of theological writers, that universal, and by far the most delightful agreement in the first man, of mind, will, and heart, with the intellect, will, and heart of God. Nor is this term improperly used; for that original perfection of nature is called *righteousness*, both in respect of its essence, because we are indeed accustomed to call that righteous, which by its own nature is true, perfect, right, sound and uncorrupt; but also in respect of its efficiency, because it makes a man righteous in the sight of God, (i. e.) innocent, acceptable and holy. Righteousness is called *original*, both because it was first of all in man, and because from the beginning he possessed it after the manner of a concreted habit, and also in order that the righteousness of man's original and first state, may be distinguished from moral, imputed, and imperfect righteousness, which is perfected in another life, and whatever else may be connected with it; and finally, because it must needs be transmitted to posterity by natural generation, inasmuch as in a state of innocence men would obtain this natural perfection with their origin, just as now, in a state of transgression, original sin is propagated, and from that very propagation is called *original*.” Calovius defines *original righteousness* to be “a habit of wisdom created in the mind, and of perfect

holiness and purity in the natural desires and heart, in virtue of which, our first parents, by natural illumination, knew the truth, even that which was spiritual, without error and doubt, and were freely inclined, by natural propensity, to that which is good, and promptly controlled their desires as they wished."

(14.) Many divines include these excellences in their definition of *image*; yet they make a distinction between *the image partly received*, which denotes knowledge and original righteousness; and *the image wholly received*, which embraces all things that complete the image of God. The excellences of the first class they call *the principal perfections, whose seat is the soul*; those of the second class are called *the less principal affections, whose seat is the body*. The latter class Quenstedt divides into *those which are partly in man and partly without him*. If these excellences are included in the definition of the *image of God*, then the following is of value in reference to the difference between *the image of God and original righteousness*:

Quenstedt.—"The image of God and original righteousness differ as the whole and a part. The image of God includes as well the principal as the secondary conformity with God, but original righteousness is ordinarily received as embracing only the principal conformity."

(15.) a) Hollaz proves the *impassibility* (of a state of innocence) or freedom from suffering in the following manner: "Painful and destructive sufferings are the punishment of sin, Gen. 3: 16, Sir. 38: 15, wherefore the first man, being without sin, was free from its bitter suffering."

Quenstedt remarks on this point: "The first pair in the state of innocence, had a body incapable of suffering, inasmuch as it was not exposed to those things which could have injured their natural disposition, and could have contributed to the death and corruption of the body. Such things were a freedom from all injuries arising from grief and trouble, especial protection against rains, winds, heat, diseases, &c., &c., and other inconveniences, which now, since the fall, are innumerable, (Gen. 2: 25) Meanwhile, however, if man had remained in his integrity, physical changes would not have been wanting, such as generation, nutrition, &c., and he would have needed food and drink for his sustentation."

b) *Immortality.* Quenstedt.—"It is proved from Gen. 2: 17; Rom. 5: 12, 6: 23."

„We must distinguish 1) between the *immortality* which denotes a freedom from the whole power and act of dying, *altogether*, (and thus God is immortal, and angels, our souls, and the bodies of the redeemed and the damned;) and the *immortality* which denotes a freedom from the proximate power of dying and the natural tendency to it, and, at the same time, from the act of dying, in such a manner, however, that death could approach upon a certain proposed condition, and such was man's immortality in his state of integrity. We must make a distinction between absolute freedom from death which will exist in another life, and a conditional or decreed freedom, which existed in the first state of man (viz: as long as he would not sin) which did not exclude, but included the use of food and drink, and especially the eating of the tree of life, by which means our first parents were enabled, in a natural way, to perpetuate life. It is one thing *not to be able to die*, and another *to be able not to die*. The latter belongs to all sinners, the former to Adam in his state of integrity, and also to the blessed.”

c) *Dominion*. Hollaz. a) God granted to the first man dominion over all sublunary things, extending over seas and lands, but not over the stars of heaven, except as far as he converted their influence to his own advantage. b) That *dominion* was not absolute and direct, but conditional and useful, which denotes the inhabiting of the earth with the use of its fruits. c) *Dominion* is received either in its radical signification *for the right and power of ruling, or formally for the act of ruling*. In the former sense, it is a part of the *less-principal image of God*; in the latter it was an *external accident or addition to that image*.”

Baier cites some more corporeal excellences, viz: “But God bestowed upon man in respect of his body also a certain image of himself, inasmuch as not only the perfections of the soul expressed themselves through the external acts of the body, but, in addition, the members themselves, of the organic body, have a certain analogy to the divine attributes, (viz:) the countenance erect towards heaven, furnishes a semblance of the divine majesty; but particularly the immortal body, or that which could endure forever, and remain free from every corruption, bears, according to the intention of God, a resemblance to the divine immortality.” Yet Baier perceives that all these excellences were not lost by the fall, and reckons these in part as belonging to the *image of God received as general*.

(16.) Therefore the original condition of man is called a most happy one. Quenstedt. "The happiness of it appears: 1) from the condition of the soul, which was wise and holy; 2) from the condition of the body, which was beautiful, not susceptible of suffering, and immortal; 3) from the condition of life, which was happy and blessed; from the condition of his habitation, which was most pleasant, truly a garden of pleasure which is called paradise."

Gerhard.—"Hence it happened that man, joyful, blessed and contented, delighted in God, his creator, there being in him neither fear, nor terror, nor sadness."

(17.) *Baier.*—"Therefore also this divine image was a natural endowment, or it belonged naturally to man, so that he might rightly perform his connate acts; since in the absence of this, his nature would not have been pure, but impure."

Holaz.—"The image of God did not, indeed, constitute the nature of the first man, after the manner of an essential part, nor did it emanate from his nature, *per se* and necessarily, as if properly inseparable from it; yet it was natural to the first man, because by creation it began to exist with his very nature, and thus it was both belonging to him, and deeply impressed in him, as also it thoroughly perfected the nature of man in his state of integrity, so that it could attain its end, and could be propagated to posterity by natural generation."

The different significations in which the word natural is used according to Quenstedt, are the following: "Anything is said to be *natural*, 1) by constitution (constitutive) because it constitutes its nature, and is either its nature, or an essential part of it, as soul and body; 2) by sequence (consecutive) because it follows its nature, and flows essentially from a form, as the faculties of the soul, teachableness, &c., &c.; 3) subjectively (subjective) because it inheres most closely to nature as a natural property; 4) by way of perfecting (perfective) because it perfects and adorns it internally; 5) by way of transfer (transitive) because with its nature it is propagated to others in a natural way. When we say that primeval justice was natural or connatural to Adam, we do not understand the word *natural* in the first or second sense, but in the third, fourth and fifth, viz: on account of a natural inhesion, perfection and propagation."

Original righteousness is not a *supernatural* gift, for that is *supernatural* which does not belong to nature from its origin, but by special grace is superadded by God to supply its

imperfection. If original righteousness, then, were a super-added gift, it would come in conflict with Gen. 1: 31.

"Hollaz opposes the papists, who maintain that the image of God was a supernatural gift superadded to man, for the purpose of supplying his connate imperfection; as a wreath or garment adorns a man externally, and as the rein restrains the horse. But as the nature of man and of the horse remains incorrupt, when the garment and the rein are removed; thus they suppose that the nature of man was not corrupted by the fall, the image of God having been removed, but that it remained upright."

Together with this assertion, is also rejected the other, concerning the state of the *purely natural*. See Note 2.

(18.) On this point divines are not agreed. Gerhard, Calovius, Quenstedt and others, call the gracious indwelling of the Trinity, &c., &c., a supernatural gift; others, as Hollaz, understand this also as a natural gift. Hollaz. "There are, indeed, some theologians of great reputation, who think that the grace of God and the indwelling of the most Holy Trinity were supernatural to the first man. Yet if we consider, 1) that the nature of the first man never was, nor ever could be upright, without the indwelling and sanctification of the Holy Spirit; 2) that original sin, which came into the place of the divine image after the fall of Adam, introduced into fallen man, not only corporeal, but also spiritual death (which consists in the deprivation of the mystical union of the soul with God); we agree with those authors, who decide that divine grace and the indwelling of the most Holy Trinity were not supernatural, but natural to the first man."

On the other hand, Hollaz points out as supernatural gifts, "extraordinary revelation and that which is connected with it (viz; positive law and supernatural strength to fulfil it,").

ARTICLE IV.

REMINISCENCES OF LUTHERAN CLERGYMEN.

XXXVIII.

NICHOLAS G. SHARRETTs.

AMONG the good, whom the year 1836 numbered with the dead, the name of Nicholas Sharretts will long be remembered with reverence and love. Although taken away in the freshness and vigor of his manhood, his beloved memory and blessed labors will not soon be forgotten. He lived long enough to make an impression upon the church, the influence of which will not speedily pass away. His sun went down in a cloudless sky, and has reflected back a radiance of glory which testifies to the great excellence of his character.

The subject of our narrative was born on the 20th of November, 1802, at Selin's Grove, Union Co., Pa. He was the oldest son of Major F. and Catharine Sharretts, who brought their first born to God in Baptism, and in this solemn ordinance recognized the Divine right to him. They sought to train their child in the way in which he should go. Guided by their instructions and example, and surrounded by religious influences and associations, his heart became early impressed with the truth. The pious endeavors of his parents were blessed. Their prayers were answered and their hopes realized. When fifteen years old, he made a public profession of his faith, and was admitted to the communion of the Church, at Carlisle, whither his parents had some time previously removed. At an early age his mind was exercised in reference to the sacred office. When any one inquired what business he intended in after life to pursue, his answer invariably was, "I want to preach the Gospel." It seemed to be his chief desire, that he might be counted worthy a place in the ministry of reconciliation. His father, however, having a large family to support, and apprehensive that he would not be able to furnish the means necessary for his education, in preparation for the work, prevailed on him to learn a trade. But the earnest aspirations of his heart were not quenched. He felt that he was called to the service of the Lord in the ministry of his Son. The Rev. Benjamin Keller, at the time his Pastor, having ascertained the state of his mind,

consulted with his parents, and finally secured their approval of Nicholas' wishes. An opportunity was at once afforded him to commence a course of study, preparatory to the great work in which he longed to engage. He was fitted by Mr. Keller for the Freshman class of Dickinson College, then under the Presidency of Rev. Dr. Mason, where, after having passed through the regular curriculum, he was graduated in 1825. During his Collegiate course, his conduct was marked by the most scrupulous regard to order, by diligence and success in study, and by a consistent and elevated Christian character. Soon after his graduation, he commenced his Theological studies, under the direction of J. G. Schmucker, D. D., of York, Pa., which were completed at our Theological Seminary, established in the meantime, by the General Synod, at Gettysburg, Pa. He was licensed to preach the Gospel by the Synod of West Pennsylvania, convened at Berlin, Somerset Co., in the fall of 1826, and in obedience to the request of his brethren, accepted the appointment of itinerant Missionary for the North Western part of the State. He visited the counties of Clearfield, Venango and Indiana, and dispensed the Word of Life to the scattered members of our Church. By the blessing of God upon his faithful labors, he did much to strengthen the weak, confirm the wavering, and to make his good influence felt for a long time in that region of country. Having proceeded in his tour, as far as Indiana and Blairsville, a number of piously disposed persons prevailed upon him to settle permanently among them, and become their Pastor. Although they were few, and the means of support scarcely adequate, yet after a serious and prayerful examination of the subject, he concluded that it was his duty to accept the call, and from the 1st of July, 1827, till the end of his earthly pilgrimage, he continued to labor here, diligently, faithfully, and with rich success. The field, which he had undertaken to cultivate being a new one, and the number of members not large, he was at first compelled to practice self-denial, and to endure much hardship. He was not, however, in his selection of the field, influenced by personal comfort or self-interest, but by love to his Master and a regard for immortal souls. Self-denial was a part of his religion. During his connexion with this charge, he was invited, not less than eight times, to remove and accept a more prominent position in the Church, where his services would have been more amply remunerated, but his attachment to his beloved flock, and his views of duty, led him to resist

every such influence, and to cling to the people of his choice. Such a Pastor would necessarily secure the esteem and confidence, the love and admiration of his congregations, and would be likely to labor with more than ordinary success. The attachment of his people, whom he had been instrumental in gathering together, was as strong as it was deserved. He was untiring in the discharge of his duties. He gave himself up wholly to the work, and determined to know nothing among men, save Jesus Christ and him crucified. The Divine blessing attended his labors. Through him, under God, many were aroused from a state of spiritual lethargy, and induced to renounce the service of sin, to turn with full purpose of heart to the Lord, and become his faithful followers. Attentive to the welfare and comfort of all around him, and striving habitually and supremely to promote their highest interests, which the true Christian should always consider the rule of his life and the disposition of his heart, he won the affections of all classes. Even if, at first, there existed a feeling of prejudice or opposition, it was speedily overcome. As an instance, it is said that when he commenced to preach at Blairsville, there lived not far from the village, a respectable but eccentric farmer, who had conceived a prejudice against him, supposing that the young preacher was a Scotchman, and that there was some doubt in reference to his character. But the more he watched him, the more his suspicions vanished. The more intimately he became acquainted with him, the better he liked him. His regard for him increased, and he became one of his most devoted friends. The whole family united with the Church, and one of the sons has since become an active and successful workman in the vineyard of the Lord.

Mr. Sharretts' death occurred on the 31st of December, 1836, in the thirty-fifth year of his age. During a tour, made for collecting funds to liquidate the debt which rested on the Indiana Church, he was attacked with fever, from which although he partially recovered, the disease remained in his system, and periodically returned, until his constitution, under its influence, gave way, and all the powers of medical skill were entirely baffled. Death did not take him by surprise. He was prepared for the summons, and showed in what peace a Christian can die. In his last moments all was calm, tranquil and confiding. He knew in whom he had believed, and departed with a certain hope of having his part with those of the first resurrection. His death-bed furnished

delightful evidence of the power of religion to sustain the soul in the final hour. To a ministerial brother who came from a distance to visit him, and inquiring whether he still trusted in Jesus, whom he had recommended to others, and firmly hoped to dwell with him on high, although unable to speak, he replied with unequivocal signs in the affirmative. With great fortitude he bore the most painful suffering during his illness, and submitted with Christian resignation to the Divine will. His eyes were soon after closed in death. Friends stood watching by the dying couch, but his spirit had gone to God who gave it, to that "bourne, whence no traveller returns."

"That form, which love had whispered would be last
To greet their dying vision, cold and still
In death is laid. The hand which they had cherished
Would return no pressure. Those lips, which cheered,
Were closed in marble stillness and gave back
No fond caress."

It was an afflictive dispensation to his family, who looked upon so sad an event as far distant in the future. Overwhelmed with grief, their strong consolation was in Him who doeth all things well, and who has given the assurance "that all things work together for good, to them that love God." They could only exclaim: "Even so, Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight!"

His remains were interred in front of the Church he had been instrumental in building, amid a host of sorrowing friends, who mourned his early departure. The solemn occasion was improved by a discourse from 2 Kings 4: 26—"Run now I pray thee, to meet her, and say unto her, Is it well with thee? Is it well with thy husband? Is it well with the child? And she answered, It is well!"—preached by Rev. C. F. Heyer.

The subject of our sketch was married on the 9th of October, 1827, just before his removal to Indiana, to Miss L. H. Spotswood, of Carlisle, who, with three small children, was left to mourn a premature and irreparable loss.

Although Mr. Sharretts' career was so brief, he was an honored minister of the Church. The native powers of his mind were highly respectable, and these had been brought under the influence of careful culture. He was also gifted as a public speaker. Forceful and persuasive, he was always listened to with interest. He was a man of sound judgment, enlightened views, of close and general observation, of frank,

open, undisguised expression of opinion and conduct. There was to be seen in him a nobleness of principle and an honest, upright deportment, which gained the confidence of all who knew him. He was faithful, able and efficient, one of our most self-denying, laborious and enterprising ministers.

“ He in the current of destruction stood
And warred victoriously with death and hell,
Yet he was humble, kind, forgiving, meek,
Easy to be entreated, gracious, mild ;
And with all patience and affection taught,
Rebuked, persuaded, solaced, counselled, warned.”

His piety was of a high order. He exhibited uniformly such an example of consistency, as to awaken no doubt as to his sincerity, or his deep, abiding interest in that cause which he professed to love, and to the promotion of which he had consecrated all his powers. His influence was felt wherever it was known. His ardent zeal was always prominent. He was ready conscientiously to give a helping hand to every object designed to promote the glory of God, and to advance the welfare of his fellow-men. Fearless in duty, and sincerely attached to his church, he cherished no bigotry or spirit of condemnation towards those who differed from him in opinion. His life was one of quiet but extensive usefulness. The results of his ministry will remain as a monument of his pious exertions, and will keep alive his memory in the hearts of those, who were the witnesses of his Christian labors.

XXXIX.

EMANUEL KELLER.

With the name of Mr. Sharretts is closely associated that of Mr. Keller. They commenced their studies together, they entered the ministry about the same time, they were nearly of the same age; of a congenial temper and kindred spirit, a warm friendship existed between them. Deeply attached to each other in life, they were not long divided in death. They were soon called to meet in that world, where separation is unknown, to commingle their notes of praise on high, and to unite in songs of redeeming love to Him who sitteth on the throne and liveth forever.

Emanuel Keller was the son of Peter and Catharine Schaeffer Keller, and was born at Harrisburg, Pa., on the 30th of September, 1801. Blessed with pious and faithful parents, he was early brought under the influence of religious truth, and in the morning of life renewed the vows assumed for him by his parents in infancy. His thoughts and desires were early turned to the Christian ministry, and after much deliberation and prayer, he resolved to devote his life to this service, and unreservedly to consecrate every power he possessed, to the good of mankind and the glory of his Creator. With great assiduity and success he commenced a course of preparatory study, under the direction of his uncle, Rev. B. Keller, and subsequently entered as a student of Dickinson College. He pursued the study of Divinity with his Pastor, Rev. Dr. Lochman, and in the year 1826, was inducted into the sacred office by the Synod of Pennsylvania. The first year of his ministry he labored at Manchester, Md. Thence he removed to Mechanicsburg, where he continued to labor without interruption, until a short time before his death, when his feeble health compelled him to resign his charge. He died Thursday April 11th, 1837, in the thirty-sixth year of his age, and was buried in the grave-yard connected with *Trindle Spring Church*, by the side of his two sons, who had preceded him into the eternal world. His funeral was a most solemn and affecting scene, and will not soon be forgotten by those who were present on the occasion. In the depth of their love, the whole people wept—

"Like flock bereft of shepherd, when snows shut out the day."

The services were conducted by Rev. D. Gottwald and Rev. J. Ulrich, the former from the words—"Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord the righteous Judge shall give me at that day;" and the latter from the text—"Well done, good and faithful servant, thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things: enter thou into the joy of thy Lord."

Mr. Keller was united in marriage, soon after the completion of his studies, on the 14th of April, 1825, to Miss Sabina Seltzer, of Harrisburg, Pa. From this union there were five children, two of whom, both daughters, are still living.

In the death of Mr. Keller, the Church mourned for one of her most useful and devoted ministers, a good man and a faithful watchman on the walls of Zion. Whether we consider his private character and exemplary life, his eminent piety,

fervent zeal, and his active devotedness to his Master, or his extensive usefulness, we can readily conceive how great a loss the Church sustained, and how poignant her grief!

Mr. Keller was a man of deep, heartfelt, humble piety, a noble specimen of a true Christian, a loving, believing disciple, who had the very spirit of his Master. That spirit pervaded his life, and created the moral atmosphere in which he lived and moved. All who came in contact with him were impressed with his high-toned, Christian principle, and his entire consecration to God. He rejected everything that was not honorable, generous, lovely or pure. The Word of God was the rule of his life, his standard of action. He was a man of habitual prayer. He enjoyed communion with God. He realized his need of the Divine aid, and at the throne of grace sought guidance and strength for the discharge of duty. His piety, too, was of an earnest, active stamp, which prompted him constantly to labor as he had opportunity for the good of others. He was a beautiful illustration of a sincere, earnest character. He was earnest in all his impulses. Perhaps his main strength or success in the ministry, was his intense, living earnestness, based upon his ardent piety and deep sense of the responsible office to which he had been called. His was an untiring, self-sacrificing devotion to the Master's cause.—No one ever entered with more zeal and energy into any measure which could possibly result in the salvation of souls, than he. His heart was in the work in which he was engaged, and he could join with the angels of heaven in rejoicing over repenting sinners. Through good and evil report, by word and deed, on all occasions he sustained and propagated his Christian principles. His deep spirituality and earnest devotion, sometimes rendered him the victim of persecution. The enemies of vital piety attempted to thwart him in his career of usefulness, and in his efforts to introduce a more rigid and scriptural discipline into the administration of the Church. His course was, by some, considered extravagant and fanatical, and he was called to pass through some severe trials, in the measures he adopted to bring about a different state of things in the Church. But strong in his convictions of right, nothing could intimidate him, or seduce him from his purpose. In his whole career, there was nothing of policy, nothing of the time-serving spirit. You always knew where to find him, and even if you differed from him in sentiment, you admired the fearlessness of the man.

As a preacher, he was plain, solemn and impressive, eminently practical and instructive. He ever sought to present the truth in its unvarnished simplicity. With a heart glowing with love to God, he proclaimed his message in that earnest manner, which is calculated to arrest the attention and to do good to the soul. Under his preaching there were deep searchings of heart, pungent convictions of sin, and the return of many a prodigal to his Heavenly Father's house.— We heard him on one occasion, and only a short time before his death, in a discourse from the words, "Redeem the time," in which he spoke with great fidelity and power, as if he realized his vast responsibility, and anxiously desired to impress his hearers with the solemn admonition he was uttering. More than twenty years have elapsed since that period, yet we have a distinct recollection of the appearance of the preacher, the character of the sermon, and the effect produced upon the audience. Mr. Keller was also unusually gifted in prayer. Whenever he led the public devotions, he made a deep impression, and produced the conviction upon the minds of those who heard him, that he did not regard prayer as an outward form of religious duty, the mere expression of the lip, but the soul's sincere desire, the consecration of the heart, with all its affections, to God, an earnest, importunate wrestling with Jehovah for his blessing. His faith in prayer had its influence upon his success.

He was a most devoted, faithful Pastor, deeply interested in his flock, and laboring with untiring zeal for their spiritual improvement. In the home of the afflicted, and at the bedside of the sick, his ministrations were most appropriate and consoling. To the poor, the neglected, the friendless and distressed, his attentions were incessant and unwearied. His manner was adapted to soothe their feelings, to inspire confidence and win the affections. He soon made his way to the hearts of all around him. His bright, open countenance, which none who were familiar with him can ever forget, was an index to his open heart. He was quick and warm in his attachments, and those who enjoyed his friendship, knew him as always the same unwavering friend. The little children loved him for the interest he took in their pleasures, and his anxiety to contribute to their comfort. Whilst he was the delight of the righteous, he was also a terror to evil doers. His influence was felt in every direction. The impious oath, the boisterous laugh, the silly jest, ceased at his approach. Even the boys, when engaged in noise on the street, or at

play on the Sabbath, would scamper off and conceal themselves from his view. He never connived at wickedness in any form, and the faithfulness which characterized his private and public instructions, never gave any of his flock the least license for neglect of duty. He was deeply beloved by his people, especially by those whom he had been instrumental in bringing to Christ. Writes one of our Pastors, who had united with the Church under his ministry: "I remember, some seven years since, when preaching at a communion season, in the Church in which I was confirmed, I referred to him, and spoke of his former labors in that place, and of his sleeping in the grave-yard close by. Scarcely had I mentioned his name, when the entire congregation was deeply affected, and many wept aloud. A work of grace at that time commenced, and I have since been informed by a number of persons, that it was generally thought to have taken its rise from that circumstance."

Mr. Keller loved the Church in which he was reared, and could not bear to hear anything said in disparagement of it. He was a decided Lutheran in his *ex animo* reception of the Augsburg Confession. He often spoke of the superiority of this Confession over all others, and upon the Catechism of Luther, he placed a very high value. But he was no formalist. He was the constant advocate of heart-felt piety, and was, we have seen, indefatigable in his efforts to bring sinners to a knowledge of the truth. He never thought that a rigid adherence to the Confession and Catechism of the Church, at variance with vital piety and genuine revivals of religion.

He was an excellent and enthusiastic Catechist. All his awakenings in the Church sprang from his Catechetical instructions. He was most industrious in seeking out persons in the congregation, and by personal conversation urging them to attend his course of lectures. He felt a sincere regard for the young men of his charge, and took pains to counsel them in reference to their future happiness and usefulness, and a remarkable trait of his character was the power he had of commanding and exercising an irresistible influence over them. Through his direct and personal instrumentality, many individuals were introduced into the ministry of the Gospel.* In the labors of these, his influence is still living, and by the life it imparts to new minds, is constantly breaking out into new

* Those whose names now occur to us, are Rev. Messrs. Charles Martin, M. D., J. L. Schock, Ephraim Miller, J. T. Williams, L. T. Williams and A. Berg.

influences. It will continue to live until the end of time, blessing the inhabitants of the earth.

One who knew him well, and who, through his instrumentality, was brought to a saving knowledge of the Redeemer, gives the following testimony in connexion with his labors at Mechanicsburg: "Religion was to me, at that time, an unpleasant subject, and more than once did I strive to avoid this good man, who never failed to urge it on my attention whenever an opportunity offered. At length he succeeded in persuading me to attend his Catechetical lectures, and never shall I forget his feeling address, and the tears of joy which flowed down his cheeks when he found that nearly all his class were seeking the salvation of their souls in earnest. He pleaded, he prayed, he wept with us, and by every possible motive, urged us to an immediate, an entire consecration to the Savior of sinners. Nor were his labors in vain; and this has convinced me that Catechetical instruction, when faithfully conducted, is one of the most efficient means in winning souls to Christ, the Church has adopted."

"The effects of the public and private ministrations of our Pastor now began to make their appearance. The Spirit of God began to move upon the hearts and consciences of the people, and from this time, one continued revival of religion existed in his congregation. These scenes seemed to be the element in which he lived. He entered into them with that energy of spirit, that devotion of soul which, overlooking every opposing barrier, every selfish consideration, is wholly absorbed in the 'one thing needful.' I have seen him in the pulpit, warning and entreating the impenitent to flee from the wrath to come, with the feeling heart and the tearful eye. I have heard him proclaim the thunders of the law against the ungodly, until they trembled and cried mightily, 'Men and brethren, what must we do to be saved?' I have heard him proclaim the terrors of the law, and point the poor trembling penitent to 'the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world.' I have seen him in the anxious meeting, surrounded by immortal souls, crying for mercy and forgiveness, endeavoring to soothe the wounded spirit and bind up the broken heart, and as some sin-burdened soul would find peace in believing, I have witnessed the joy which lightened up every feature of his countenance. I have heard the gratitude which he, at such times, poured forth to his God, and the songs of praises he hymned to his Maker; and in all these relations, I may safely say, he was a picture at which not

only men, but angels might gaze with delight. They will never be forgotten by those who witnessed them, and the good accomplished will only be known at the great day of final account. I loved him devotedly, and when he died I felt that I had lost the best friend I ever had. I can say that his memory is precious to me, and that to the latest day of my life I shall bless God, that he was once my Pastor."*

Mr. Keller's death, as might be supposed from his life, was a most happy and triumphant one. God called him, and he went cheerfully and submissively home. During his illness he spoke with the utmost composure, and with the liveliest hopes of his approaching end—of his utter unworthiness, and of his entire dependence upon the Lord Jesus Christ for salvation. He had set his house in order, and calmly, in full consciousness, awaited the hour of his departure. A few weeks before his death, he selected a work on experimental and practical piety out of his library, for each of his brothers and sisters, and he had a word of affection and exhortation for all who visited him. Says one who had an opportunity of knowing, "The parting scene between him and his family was one of deep solemnity, of unusual tenderness. Feeling that death was about to lay his icy hand upon him, he called all his friends around him. A death-like stillness reigned in the chamber. Scarcely a breath was heard or a sigh heaved—every heart beat quick, every eye was suffused with tears. There he lay, apparently in the arms of death, with an expression of heavenly serenity on his countenance; around his couch kneeled the partner of his bosom with her tender offspring by her side. He had prepared them for the event—he had told them not to sorrow on his account, that he was going to heaven, where he soon expected to meet them again, never to be separated. He gave them his parting blessing, and committed them to the care of Him who has promised to be a husband to the widow and a father to the fatherless. He ceased to speak. A gentle smile of resignation played on his lips, and then, as if in obedience to the herald angels hovering around his dying pillow, gently whispering, '*Sister spirit, come away,*' his soul quietly freed itself from its frail tenement of clay, and in company with the heavenly messenger, winged its flight to the mansions of the blessed." Released from the sufferings and sorrows of this life, he had ascended on high, and there, from the lips of his

* Rev. J. L. Schock, of New York city.

blessed Master, heard the welcome plaudit, "Well done, good and faithful servant, thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things: enter thou into the joy of thy Lord!"

"See there he walks on yonder mount that lifts
 Its summits high, on the right hand of bliss,
 Sublime in glory, talking with his peers
 Of the incarnate Savior's love and passed
 Affliction, lost in present joy! See how
 His face with heavenly ardor glows, and how
 His hand enraptured, strikes the golden lyre!"

ARTICLE V.

HUMAN NATURE.

THE subject is Human Nature, the knowledge of which is certainly to be regarded as important. The phrase is very common, it is frequently employed. We hear it said of writers, that they exhibit, in their works, much or great knowledge of human nature, that they dissect or unravel the workings of the human heart, and delineate man as he is.—In conversation, it is said of one man that he is distinguished for his acquaintance with the human heart, of another that he is not deeply skilled in the science of man. It is regarded as praise, to be represented as knowing man and dispraise, not to understand the hidden movements of the soul, the springs of action, and not to know how to touch and move them at our pleasure. What, then, is this knowledge of Human Nature, of which so much is said, and of which so much account is taken, and what have we to do with it? To answer these inquiries to some extent, is what I shall now briefly attempt. First, I will present a sketch of this nature of which we are about to speak.

What is it? It belongs to a class of existences in this universe, dwelling on this globe, of which we ourselves are a part, distinguished by position and endowments, and denominated, generically, Man. Further analysis teaches us that it is not simple, but compound, consisting of two leading essences, matter and spirit, or body and soul. These, in close

and intimate union, mutually operating on each other, admirably organized and wonderfully endowed, have, since the creation of man, displayed properties which may be considered their history, the knowledge of which is the knowledge of human nature. In the broadest sense, then, Human Nature consists of man's physical structure, the animal machine, fearfully and wonderfully made, constructed to hold converse with surrounding objects, by means of its senses, which convey impressions to the mind, adapted to receive and appropriate nutritive agents by a digestive apparatus, to transfer and transmute them by an assimilative function, to elaborate necessary agents by glandular combinations, to perform locomotions by operose and muscular arrangements, and to put forth dynamical efforts by animal machinery.

Further, it consists of a thinking essence, whose centre is not definable, but whose presence and agency are not at all questionable. Different from matter, because invisible and cogitative, it is characterized by attributes which have no affinity either with extension or passivity. Communing with the body by means of nervous media, and through the body with the world, and, to a large extent, with the universe of God, it is started into action and speeded in its course by external influences, and moulds what is delivered to it in various forms, either by intuition or reflexion. It is not, however, restricted to such phenomena as the nerves of sensation, brought into action, produce, but has control over those of motion, and uses the body as the instrument of its own purposes. Its emotions and its passions, those gentle or violent movements, which agitate its calm surface, closely linked with man's happiness or sorrow, sources of exquisite pleasure or excruciating pain—the play of which constitutes so important a part of man's history, are not to be lost sight of in a survey of our nature. Nor must we omit that bright jewel in the crown of our gifts, moral sense, the approbation of virtue, the abhorrence of crime, the sense of duty, the impulse to do right, to stand aloof from wrong, in a word, conscience. Human nature may be said not only to consist in these two great constituents, but of them in particular conditions. The conditions may be entirely normal or perfect, or they may be the contrary. There may be perfect harmony, or there may be discord. They may work in unison, or there may be jarring. The master may be good, or he may be bad. The servant may be obedient, or he may be rebellious.

The emotions and passions may move in prescribed limits, or they may leap over all bounds. The moral sense may be in full exercise in the right direction, or it may be perverted and silenced, and with impulses unheeded or not at all given forth, its office may cease. Man may be either holy or depraved—and if the latter is true of him, Human Nature then has as a characteristic, which is not to be lost sight of, a material element in the study of it, in determining what it is—moral derangement, the rightful regent has been dispossessed of his throne, and a usurper has taken his place.

I have now given you a brief, but very imperfect sketch of Human Nature; the next inquiry is, what is knowledge of Human Nature? It has been said by a poet who is called philosophical, that the proper study of mankind is man. Anthropology, taking it in the fullest sense, is indeed an important study; it embraces a great deal, and human life is too short to exhaust it. But our inquiry now is—what is knowledge of Human Nature? Here is a man, who from professional considerations or others, has given himself up to the study of the animal frame. He has read books of anatomy, he has made himself acquainted with all the technical terms employed in describing the body, he has gone into the dissecting room, and had exposed before him, all that is visible to the eye, and all that can be made visible by the best instruments, he understands every bone, knows every foramen, is acquainted with every process, is familiar with articulations of different kinds, has traced the muscles from their origins to their insertions, and knows how they act separately and conjointly to perform certain movements, he has seen the Cerebrum and Cerebellum, the Medulla Obl. and Spin. the ganglionic system and the nervous, and learned their functions; he has investigated the different organs of secretion, and the entire digestive and circulating and assimilating apparatus; in a word, he is an Anatomist; does he understand human nature? he knows something, but we would not say that he understands human nature. He has laid a good foundation, but that is all. We take another man, or the same man, if you choose, and carry him a step further; he is now learned in all the physiological functions. He is not only an anatomist, but he is a physiologist, he knows all the vital operations and beautiful chemistry of the human system; he knows the relation of the saliva to digestion, and the change produced by the gastric juice; how the bile subserves man's growth and restoration, what is done by the pancreas and spleen and kidneys,

and what is the precise relation of the atmosphere, with its oxygen and nitrogen, to the blood, when taken into the lungs, and how animal heat is produced, &c., &c. This man has very interesting knowledge, he is acquainted with very astonishing and beautiful processes, but does he know human nature? he knows something, he is nearer unquestionably the temple, but he is still in the portico. We take another man, or the same man, with additional insight into man's nature, we take him beyond the body, we pass the mysterious limit between the material and immaterial, we present a disciple of Locke, or Reed, or Kant, or Cousin, or Hamilton, a metaphysician. He knows what man's spirit is—he has studied it. He knows whence its knowledge is derived. He knows what is meant by sensation, consciousness, memory, judgment, reason, imagination, the will, the affections, the conscience, &c.; in a word, he is a metaphysician; has studied well, and studied profitably, the mysterious workings of the inner man, fathomed the questions of necessity and freedom. Surely he will be admitted to know human nature, if with these attainments, he is acquainted with man's anatomy and physiology; but we say again, whatever value we may concede to his knowledge, and it is not small, still he does not yet come up to the standard. Another has made himself familiar with the workings of the human passions, knows how men are influenced, what will win their favor, and by what they will be repelled, how they may betray themselves into weaknesses, and plunge themselves into follies and crimes, how they may be inflamed with enmity, and be employed as instruments to accomplish selfish purposes; and this, with many, is regarded as pre-eminently worthy of the name, and it is this which is often referred to, when men are said to have knowledge; it is knowledge of this kind, when employed in promoting selfish ends, in procuring advantages, in circumventing rivals, and frustrating those that are in the way of our ambition, which is highly prized, highly lauded, and the man who is destitute of it, or who scorns to use human weakness to degrade man, by making him the tool of selfishness, that is considered destitute of a knowledge of Human Nature.

It must be conceded that to know man's weaknesses and imperfections, although in itself but a part of human knowledge, is, nevertheless, a part, and though susceptible of abuse, and frequently abused by men of low virtue, in the study of man it cannot be overlooked. We would then say, that to know Human Nature, is to know man as he is, in his structure,

physical and mental, in his developments, his characteristics, his susceptibilities and his passions, his strength and his weakness, in the image of his Maker, not yet entirely illegible, and in the mournful traces of depravity which so darkly shade his glory.

Such as man is, we should seek to know him. To make him our study, ought to be our purpose, and confining ourselves to no limited view, we should endeavor to scan the entire surface, that carrying away rich spoil, we may be opulent in true wealth. To restrict ourselves, in the spirit of Jesuitism, to human frailties, and to study them simply for the purpose of promoting selfish ends, I consider as near an approximation, as can be made by man, to the conduct of fiends.

Knowledge of human nature should be sought. Terence says, *Inspicere tanquam in speculum, in vitas omnium jubeo, atque ex aliis sumere exemplum sibi!* The purposes for which this knowledge should be desired, are obvious. Within the circle of human knowledge, there is nothing more necessary for man to know, than that nature of which he partakes, in common with so many others. From it we can derive, not only the strongest evidences of the divine existence, but moreover, learn many of the most glorious perfections of the Godhead. If in creation the animate is superior to the inanimate, in animated creation man stands at the head. Made a little lower than the angels, and crowned with glory and honor, he was made to have dominion over the works of God's hands; all things were put under his feet: all sheep and oxen, yea, and the beasts of the field; the fowl of the air, and the fish of the sea, and whatever passeth through the paths of the seas. Man, as he is, and as he has been, with all the varieties in his appearance, structure and development, furnishes for the intellect a most attractive study, which, we have reason to believe, awakens interest in higher realms. The working out the great moral problem of human salvation, bringing into exercise many of the most glorious attributes of the Deity, and putting into requisition the uncreated essences of eternity, gives a new direction to the thoughts, the meditations and the praises of heaven. And the being whose unfolding destiny leads angels and archangels to reverential gaze, shall he be regarded by us, whose personal interest is so intense, as unworthy of our profound contemplation?

Man in himself combining everything calculated to excite curiosity, and to reward it, furnishing the highest study in

his extraordinary endowments, so intimately linked with the great Father of all, surely claims of us attention careful and minute, exhaustive investigation of what he is, so far as we can make it. The heathen sage expressed a great truth, and worthy of the enshrinement it has obtained, when he uttered his "*γνωθε σεατον.*" He designed, no doubt, to present this as knowledge specially deserving of the attention of man, specially adapted to be subservient to his highest good, specially adapted to elevate his thoughts and affections to a superior and superintending power.

In studying Human Nature, we study ourselves. For as in water, face answereth to face, so doth the heart of man to man. What others are, we are. Circumstances which though not omnipotent, exert much influence upon, and strongly control our character; education, taking it in its broadest sense, secular and Christian, may make great differences in human beings, and though there may be radical diversities, both sexual and temperamental, still there is a marked identity, and the differences which appear, are not so much the result of elemental proclivities, as of training agencies. The criminal propensities which have been matured into passions precipitating into overt crime, may have pleaded in other hearts, but counter-pleas may have chained them. In studying Human Nature, in any or all its manifestations, we are studying ourselves, in looking into others' organization, whether physical or mental, we are looking into our own, and when we have sketched on the canvass, a faithful picture of humanity, we cannot but be struck with its resemblance to ourselves.

How valuable knowledge of this kind is, it is easy for us to discern. Looking but at a single aspect, knowledge of our temperament, our susceptibilities, our weaknesses, our errors, can anything be more important in that discipline which our highest good requires, and our moral nature enjoins. Successful prescription, however copious our remedial agents, can only be accomplished when we are masters of the disease.—We can administer tonics successfully, not merely when we know them, but see where and when they are needed. We can order cathartics when we are aware of offending matter which must be carried off. We can dissect away or cut off, only when we know what cannot with safety remain. In the culture of the intellect and of the heart, in fitting ourselves for honor and usefulness here, in preparing ourselves for that noble sphere where glorified humanity will be the instrument of expanded intellect and sauntified affections—this knowledge

is pre-eminently important. This knowledge will enable us properly to use our faculties and attainments, and to influence others for their good. In our intercourse with our fellow-men, if that intercourse is to be pleasant and useful, we ought to understand Human Nature. Social in our nature, formed for society, capable of giving and receiving, we are best prepared for both, when we understand ourselves and others. Our aim should be to do good, to do good to our kind; to do it in large measures, to do it always. And this is best effected by the intelligent, and the intelligence we mainly need, is that knowledge of which we speak. Weakness should excite our compassion, and not be used for our profit. The ignorant should be protected, not ensnared into mischief. The weak-eyed should not be blinded by our superior light, but assisted in a safe progress. Our substance should be employed, not in corrupting the corruptible, but in battering down vice, and promoting the glory of God among the children of men.

And yet there remains the question, how is this knowledge to be acquired? A most important inquiry, and one which deserves a better response than I can give to it. In attempting something, it may be remarked that, as this knowledge embraces several particulars, its acquisition must have respect to these particulars. If we begin with the animal structure, it is best learned from books of anatomy and the demonstrations of a skillful anatomist in the dissecting room. For the most perfect knowledge, such as the healing art requires, it is deemed indispensable that we should use the dissecting knife ourselves, and trace out the parts with all their accompaniments, and in their relations to each other. There is a great difference between a muscle, beautifully exposed to the eye in an anatomical theatre and that muscle before it is bared for this purpose—there is a great difference between plates (though highly useful) and the real subject. If physiology is to be acquired, it must be by reading the best works, hearing the best teachers, and so far as their is *terra incognita* experiments. Accessions are constantly making to our knowledge of animal functions, by experiments and observations, particularly from the vantage ground of Chemistry. But passing away from the material part and material functions, although some of them are of a very sublimated order, particularly where there is the play of elective affinity and electric and galvanic phenomena, we look to our inner man, where there are no bones, no muscles, no membranes, no nerves, no blood vessels, but intellections, and feelings, and volitions,

and seek to know how we are to become acquainted with this part of our constitution. Important for this purpose is inspection and observation. By the first we mean anatomizing our minds. Taking our hooks and scalpels, and catching up and spreading out, that the inner eyes may behold all the different parts of our mental conformation, and then studying their operations. This is another species of anatomy, in the study of which we may find striking analogies between the body and the soul; organs to receive and digest mental food, to bring it into new combinations, and secrete it in new forms, to create and diffuse it, so that it will become nutritious. We have this constantly with us and the means of studying, and if we have cultivated, and we should cultivate, habits of abstraction and introspection, we may be daily learners of the most useful knowledge, and though studying but one, it will be true *ex uno omnes discimus*. An acquaintance with what the Germans call the *Gefühlsvermögen*, or the emotional part of our nature, and its relation to the active powers, can very successfully be studied in this way.

Observation is valuable. By this is meant, noticing the movements of our fellow-men. In contact daily with others, in various relations, we have abundant opportunities of becoming acquainted with them—not merely their physical peculiarities, but likewise the qualities of their heads and hearts. We can see how they are affected by what is taking place in the world, what are their good or bad qualities, what may be expected of them, and what may not, how they may be influenced for good or evil. We should avail ourselves of all these opportunities, and seek to know others, that we may know ourselves, that we may learn to imitate where imitation is advisable, that we may learn to pity where compassion is needed, and to protect where weakness turns to us for help. In addition to what has been mentioned, let me advise you, in the study of human nature, to read such books as throw light on it—history, biography, poetry, works illustrative of the human heart, which either give us ideals of man as he should be or as he is, not “Gorgons, Chimeras and Hydras dire,” which would exclude, I suppose, a vast amount of what comes under the title fiction.

Such pictures of Human Nature as we have in some of the ancient writers of satire, Horace, Juvenal and Persius, and writers of that class in modern times, of the highest order, as well as those who, in other forms, have dramatized the passions, are highly useful if properly employed.

Above everything else, the Bible is to be recommended to the student of Human Nature. There we have the only perfect picture of man, drawn by him who knows what is in man. It is presented fully, in its origin, progress, culmination; in its manifestations and its tendencies, in its diagnosis and its therapeutics. Make this the man of your counsel, and let it be a light to your feet and a lamp to your path. It will teach you what man is, and what you are, what is your great work, and that work has reference to man; it will teach you both to cultivate your own powers for a nobler existence, and present to you your fellow-men, not to be down-trodden and debased by your instrumentality, but to be honored for their worth, to be protected in their weakness, and to be directed into pure paths.

ARTICLE VI.

MIRACLES.

By Rev. D. H. Focht, New Bloomfield, Pa.

BIBLICAL supernaturalism discusses the supernatural* occurrences mentioned in the sacred scriptures, or the extraordinary events in nature.

The uniform modes of the Divine operation are, by philosophers, called the *laws of nature*, and, in the Scriptures, the *ordinances of heaven and earth* (Jer. 33: 25; Job 38: 33); and the ordinary agency of Deity, in the production of uniform effects in nature, we call the *ordinary course of nature*.

Those occurrences which take place above and beyond the ordinary course of nature, we call *supernatural*, as they have their cause neither in the essence nor powers of created things, and therefore not in nature, nor proceed from the aggregate essence and powers of the created universe, and therefore not from the totality of nature;† but they are effects

* The term *supernatural*, in an extended sense, includes all the wonders in the kingdom of grace, as conversion, &c., and of the Divine mysteries, as the Trinity, &c. We employ it here in a limited sense, including supernatural events in the material world only.

† By *nature* we here mean the totality of created things, be they material or spiritual, in contrast with God, who is the infinite and supernatural cause of all things.

proceeding from the free-will and produced by the almighty power of the Creator alone.

Such supernatural and extraordinary effects as transcend all the powers of created things, and are beyond the ordinary and divinely established course of nature, we denominate—*Miracles.*

I. SCRIPTURE NAMES OF MIRACLES.

Supernatural effects are called miracles, *miracula*, because they are wonderful occurrences produced in a wonderful way by God, who is a wonderful being, Ps. 105: 5, and because they excite great wonder in those who witness them.* This is also the meaning of the word, *σαῦμα, res mira*, a wonder, and *σαυπάσιον, mirabile*, something wonderful, and of the Claldeo word, *וְרָאָמָרְתָּ, mirabilia*, wonders, Dan. 3: 32, 33; 6: 28, which is derived from *וְרָאָמָרְתָּ, miratus fuit, obstupuit*, to be astonished, to wonder. The Hebrew word, *נִבְחָר, mirum, miraculum*, miracle, derived from *נִבְחַר Niph.*, *relatus, occultus fuit*, veiled, hid, implies the idea of difficulty, of something that is hard to be understood, because miracles are mysteries that exceed our powers of comprehension, or they are effects too high and wonderful for us to understand, Ps. 139: 6; Job 42: 3.

The sacred writers designate miracles especially by the following terms: 1.) *τέρας* and *σημεῖον, signum*, a sign, because miracles are signs or evidences of the Divine presence and interposition, John 3: 2. 2.) *τέρας* and *τίμας, prodigium, portentum*, prodigy, omen, because miracles transcend the ordinary course of nature, and excite the idea of great power. 3.) *παράδοξα*, strange things, Luke 5: 26, because miracles are uncommon effects, and cannot be explained by natural laws. 4.) *δυνάμεις, δυνάμεις*, power, powerful works, Matt. 7: 22; 11: 20, 23; Acts 2: 22; 6: 8; 8: 13; 2 Cor. 12: 12, because in the working of miracles God signally displays his power

* *Σαυπάσιον, to wonder, marvel*, is sometimes called the daughter of ignorance, because we wonder at what we do not or cannot understand. Miracles, as wonders, broke the slumbers of the senses, arrested attention, and awakened certain dispositions and emotions, as aversion, gloom, Mark 6: 2, comp. v. 3, 5, great joy in what is good, and satisfaction in what is agreeable, Matt. 7: 28; 8: 10; Mark 7: 37; 11: 18; Luke 2: 33, 47; Acts 3: 12; 13: 12, and hence the word has various meanings in the Scriptures, denoting sometimes the emotions or feelings which proceeded from a knowledge of Divine things and a true faith, and at times those emotions which proceeded from ignorance and unbelief.

above and beyond the ordinary course of nature. 5.) ἔργα τοῦ θεοῦ, works of God, or, by way of eminence, ἔργα, works, because miracles are exclusively and pre-eminently the work of God. 6.) Miracles are also called *the finger of God*, and *the hand of God*, that is, they are demonstrations of Divine omnipotence, Exod. 8: 19; Luke 11: 20; 1 Sam. 5: 11; Ezra 8: 31. 7.) The apostle Paul calls miracles, or the Divine power by which miracles were wrought, in general, πνευματικά, spiritual gifts, 1 Cor. 12: 12; 14: 1, πνευματικά, spirits, 1 Cor. 14: 12, comp. John 7: 39; Acts 19: 2, and πνευματικοὶ ἀγίοι μετεπομοι, distributions of the Holy Spirit, Heb. 2: 4, because in the performance of miracles, the Holy Spirit exhibits his presence in a striking way, working all things, and dividing his miraculous gifts to every man severally, according to his own will.

II. DEFINITION OF A MIRACLE.

A correct and precise definition is indispensable to a correct idea of a miracle. Before we give what we conceive to be such a definition, we will first clear our way by briefly reviewing some of the most common, and, as we think, erroneous, or at least defective definitions of a miracle.

1. Some suppose the *formal*, i. e., the essence or the peculiar nature of a miracle, to consist in its being merely an *extraordinary* occurrence, and they define a miracle to be such an uncommon or unusual event in nature as no one can, or knows how to explain according to the ordinary and well known laws of nature, and therefore these occurrences are, especially by the vulgar, who do not understand nature and its laws, regarded as miracles or effects produced by a supernatural power. This is the definition of Spinoza and his followers. It is both erroneous and dangerous. For by ascribing miracles to unknown natural powers alone, God's agency in their production is wholly excluded, and consequently their supernatural character is denied; and further, if we were more fully acquainted with nature and its laws, miracles would, according to this definition, cease to be miracles.

2. Some suppose the essence of a miracle to consist in its being a *supernatural* effect. Those who hold this view, define a miracle to be such an effect in nature as strikes the senses and transcends all the powers of nature or natural second causes. This view has been very generally adopted. Two very serious objections lie, however, against it. For, a) Not all miracles exceed the powers of nature or second causes,

since a large number of them can be adduced which, under other circumstances, *might* have been produced by finite (angelic) and natural powers, as the healing of some diseases. And, b.) According to this definition it is impossible to determine with certainty whether a given effect is or is not a miracle, because no one understands all the powers of nature, and can, therefore, not know what nature can do, or what exceeds its power.

3. Others combine the preceding two definitions, and suppose the essence of a miracle to consist in being both an *extraordinary* and *supernatural* effect. And by a miracle these understand such an effect as transcends not only all the powers of nature, but also all the divinely established laws of nature. Those who hold this view will find it difficult, with the extraordinary theory, to escape being suspected of Spinozism, on the one hand, and impossible, on the other, to determine what is or is not a supernatural effect, and therefore what is or is not a real miracle.

4. Some define a miracle to be a *suspension* of the laws of nature. This view was strongly advocated by the celebrated English physician, Dr. Bernhard Connor, who essayed, on the suspension theory, to prove the possibility of miracles, and to rebut the objections urged against them by the so-called deists and materialists. This view is unsatisfactory, being founded on the erroneous principles of the so-called *occasionalists*, who maintained that all changes and effects in nature were produced, not by any second causes or created agencies, but by the free-will of God, who is himself the sole efficient cause of every change and effect in nature, and at pleasure conforms to or deviates from the laws he has himself prescribed. If carried out in its consequences, this theory would make God the author of sin, and arbitrary in his government of the natural and spiritual world.

5. Others define a miracle to be a *superhuman* effect, that is, an effect that transcends all human power. This definition is correct, as far as it goes; but it comes short of accounting for a large number of miracles mentioned in the Bible. Besides, if all superhuman effects are miracles, then it follows that evil spirits wrought miracles too, for they did many things beyond the power of man; but whilst we admit that Satan can do wonderful and strange things, we, at the same time, maintain that he cannot perform a proper miracle. For it is doubtful whether God can delegate to a finite creature the power of effecting anything beyond the ordinary laws he

has established. The working of real miracles, it seems to us, is the exclusive prerogative of God, implying creative potency. It is true, men and angels often wrought real miracles; but then they were only the instruments, while God himself was the efficient cause of the miracles. Now we presume no one can believe that God ever employed Satan as an instrument in the working of miracles, and how then can any one believe that Satan ever wrought a *real* miracle? The last class we shall mention, embraces those who define a miracle to be an effect produced *against* or *contrary to* the ordinary course or laws of nature. To this definition it may be objected, *a.*) That God would thus be opposing his power against his law, and therefore be in conflict with himself, and *b.*) That another miracle would be required to restore the disturbed course of nature to its former order (*miraculum restitutionis*). Augustine already said: "In working miracles, God does nothing contrary to nature. To us, extraordinary events seem to be contrary to nature, but not to God, the author of nature."* For aught we know to the contrary, miracles may be the perfecting of nature and its laws. By a short process, Christ turned water into wine, not by working against the natural law, but by supplementing it, or by superadding a higher and more glorious law. Thus, according to the ordinary process, the moisture of the earth is slowly and gradually absorbed, and finally becomes wine; but according to a more perfect law, Christ shortened the process by instantly turning water into wine. From water blood is slowly elaborated in all living animals; but by shortening the process, God, through Moses, at once made water blood. This principle will apply to a large number of miracles. And in all these instances, there was no effect produced really *contrary to* what nature ordinarily produces.

Having found the above definitions more or less objectionable, we propose the following: *A miracle is a supernatural effect produced, not by any second cause or causes, but by God himself.*

This definition is concise, and explains the nature of miracles fundamentally. For, 1. We define miracles to be *supernatural effects*, not because we suppose that the *formal* or *essence* of miracles consists in their being wholly and in every respect beyond the ordinary powers of nature, but because

* *Deus in miraculis nihil contra naturam facit: insolita nobis contra naturam esse videntur, non Deo, qui naturam fecit.* *De Civ. Dei,* 21, 8.

they are produced by a supernatural cause, namely God, who coöperates in an extraordinary manner with nature in their production. Hence they are here ascribed to him alone, as he is their efficient cause. Some miracles, it may therefore be correctly said, are both natural and supernatural, because they are wrought by God through the instrumentality of natural or second causes. 2. When we say that miracles are not produced by *second causes*, but by God himself, we admit that some of them are of such a character that, in a different way, and under other circumstances, finite or second causes *might* have been adequate to their production;* but we maintain at the same time that, in the manner, and at the time the Scriptures say they were wrought, they *could not*

* We presume all who receive the Bible as a revelation from God, admit that the following were real miracles, as e. g., the change of water into blood in Egypt, the terrible tempest of hail, lightning and thunder, the great number of quails that covered the camp in the wilderness, the clothes that waxed not old upon the Israelites (Deut. 29:5), the swallowing up of Korah and his accomplices by the opening earth, the cloud of fire, the fall of the walls of Jericho, the fire falling from heaven in the days of Elijah (2 Kings 1:10—12), the bitter waters made sweet, the fig-tree withered, the water turned into wine at Cana, &c., &c.; and yet we suppose no one, who has at all observed the ordinary operations of nature, will say that these miracles were wholly beyond the power of second causes, and in no way founded in the essence and powers of nature. For we know from observation and experience, that water is often turned into blood, yea, continually by a slow process in every living animal; that great tempests of hail, lightning and thunder, and earthquakes and a consequent subsidence of the earth, occur frequently; that large numbers of birds are often killed by storms, and clothes preserved a long time by taking care of them; that fiery appearances are often seen in the heavens (as the aurora borealis, &c.,), and what seemed to be fire, has fallen frequently from the heavens (as meteors, falling stars and stones, &c.); that trees have withered in a short time, and one substance been changed into another, &c., &c. Besides, we believe it is generally admitted that spirits are endowed with far greater natural powers than mortals, and that they can influence or operate upon material bodies. Now, who can tell what effects they may produce in nature, by their superior natural powers? or who can say that every miracle recorded in the Bible transcended all their powers? Good angels or spirits would do nothing but what was in accordance with God's will, and he, as we know, often employed them as instruments of mercy or punishment to men. Doubtless, as circumstances would require, they employed their natural powers in the execution of God's judgments upon the wicked. So Satan may use his natural power in a different way—in opposing what is good, as, in Egypt he produced wonderful effects, but still these were not real miracles, because they were produced by his merely natural power and wisdom. Though finite and natural powers might have produced some of the miracles recorded in the Bible, still it cannot be shown that they did so, or that miracles are merely natural effects.

have proceeded from second causes, but must have been produced by the interposition of the Divine power. It would therefore be a great and dangerous error to reduce any miracles to a level with the ordinary operations of nature, or to explain them by merely natural laws. Still, when viewed in certain aspects, we must admit that the number of miracles, wholly exceeding all the powers of second causes, is comparatively small.* Hence, in the definition we propose, we make provision for that large class of miracles which, under a different combination of circumstances, might have been produced by second causes. To say, as some do, that miracles transcend all the powers of nature, would involve us in inextricable difficulties. Suppose this definition were admitted as correct, namely, that all miracles, without exception and in every respect, transcend all the powers of nature or second causes, then it would necessarily follow, 1.) That unless an effect exceeds nature and all its powers, it cannot be a miracle. Thus the majority of miracles would be swept out of the Bible; for the Scriptures actually inform us of many miracles, which are of such a character that, in a different way, natural causes might have produced them. 2.) That a perfect knowledge of all the powers of nature would be required, in order to decide what nature can do, or what exceeds its power; but no one can lay claim to such a knowledge; and therefore it could not be shown that a real miracle was ever wrought, or that it was not the product of nature. Such disastrous inferences flow legitimately from this definition. It is incorrect, and therefore we reject it.

While we do not, according to the definition we propose, believe that the laws of nature or second causes *could* or *ever did* produce what the Scriptures call miracles, we maintain at the same time, that it is wholly beyond our ability to determine to what extent second causes were employed by Deity in their production, or in what way and to what degree the laws of nature were modified, supplemented or perfected by a higher law, or to what extent miracles were natural or supernatural. And further, while no one can possibly show that

* To this class belong, e. g., miracles wrought on the sun and moon (Joshua 10: 12-14), the raising the dead to life, the restoration of limbs to the maimed (Matt. 15: 30), &c. These were acts of creative power. Finite powers, be they spiritual or otherwise, were wholly inadequate to their production. Nor can it be supposed that God would confer on any spirit, however exalted, the power of working such miracles—miracles that require creative powers, and in every way resemble a new creation.

second causes did not, in any way, contribute toward the production of miracles, we can show abundantly that, in the ordinary course of nature, many effects are produced, in a different way, it is true, but similar in their results to many miracles recorded in the Bible. In the ordinary way, bread is annually produced by a slow process and a continuous succession of second causes; but Christ shortened this process, by miraculously and instantly multiplying the bread. Christ was equally in both, and all the difference between the two processes, so far as we can see, consisted not so much in the extent of power manifested, as in the form or manner of its manifestation, and what Christ did once, and at once miraculously, he does continually and slowly in the ordinary course of nature. Here the ordinary law of nature was not destroyed, nor was the effect produced in every respect beyond nature; but by the addition of a higher law, nature put forth its powers in an unwonted manner—it is a miracle now.

III. RELATION OF MIRACLES AND MYSTERIES.

Miracles and mysteries are closely related; but they are not in every respect the same. Every miracle is a mystery, but every mystery is not a miracle. A mystery is a *fact*;^{*} a miracle is an *effect*. Hence there are as many mysteries that are not miracles, as there are facts that are not effects. The Holy Trinity is a fact or mystery, but not an effect or miracle. In nature many facts are mysterious, but not miraculous. Mysteries are ordinary and natural; miracles are extraordinary and supernatural; but both mysteries and miracles surpass human comprehension.

The word *mystery*, in Greek *μυστήριον*, in Hebrew *תְּרוּם* signifies something that is concealed or hidden, or something unknown till revealed, 1 Cor. 13: 2; 14: 2. The sacred writers use it sometimes to denote what is evil, as the mystery of iniquity in general, 2 Thess. 2: 7, and the harlot of Babylon in particular, Rev. 17: 5, 7; but they use it generally to designate what is good, either for some articles of the Christian

* We define a mystery to be a *fact, reality or truth*, because, 1.) Some of the most important doctrines in the Christian system of religion are founded on mysteries, as the blessed Trinity, the incarnation, &c., and because, 2.) These doctrines, to be real or true, must have facts or realities for their basis. But if mysteries were not facts, the doctrines founded on them could not be real, but imaginary. Hence religious mysteries must be facts, and from these facts we deduce doctrines or doctrinal principles.

faith in particular, as the incarnation of the Son of God, 1 Tim. 3: 16, the spiritual union of Christ with believers, Eph. 5: 32, the change of those who live at Christ's second coming, 1 Cor. 15: 51, the mystery of the cross, 1 Cor. 2: 7; Job. 11: 6, or, for the doctrines of the Christian religion in general, as the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, Matt. 13: 11; Mark 4: 11; Luke 8: 10, the mysteries of God, 1 Cor. 4: 1; Col. 2: 2, the mystery of Christ, Eph. 3: 4; Col. 4: 3, the mystery of his will, Eph. 1: 9, the mystery of the Gospel, Eph. 6: 19, the mystery of the faith, 1 Tim. 3: 9, because all these are inscrutable to the natural understanding, and can be learned alone from the Divine word, through the illumination of the Holy Spirit, Matt. 16: 17; Danl. 2: 27—30; Amos 3: 7; Eph. 1: 9; 3: 3, 5; Col. 1: 26, 27; Deut. 29: 29; Ps. 25: 14.

Religious mysteries are facts or truths revealed by God, and could not have been known to exist without a Divine revelation. They may be divided into three classes. 1. Such as ceased to be mysteries after they were explained or actually realized, as the parable of the sower and seed, Matt. 13: 11, comp. v. 18 seq., the calling of the Gentiles, Rom. 16: 25, &c. 2. Such as may, in some good measure, be explained or understood, as the restoration of the Jews, Rom. 11: 25, the seven churches in Asia, Rev. 1: 20, &c. 3. Such as those of whose existence, or reality and certainty we are sure, but whose mode or manner of existence we cannot comprehend,* as the Holy Trinity, the union of the human and

* Though we cannot comprehend the *mode* in which these facts are related, or how they exist, yet we know from revelation the facts themselves, and from them, and not the mode of their existence, we deduce doctrines. Thus, we know that there are three persons in the Godhead, and hence this fact is a doctrine; but we do not understand the relation subsisting between the three persons, or the mode of their existence, and hence the *mode* of their existence cannot be a doctrine. So also with regard to the two natures in Christ; we know the *fact* that Christ is true God and true man, and this is therefore a doctrine; but we do not understand the nature of the relation subsisting between his divinity and humanity, or the mode in which they are related, and therefore the *mode* of their relation and presence cannot be a doctrine. Hence, in every mystery there must be facts, and facts which we know, and these furnish us the basis of doctrines; but then every mystery embraces also relations and modes which we cannot comprehend, and these can never serve as the foundation of articles of belief. Thus, e. g., the mystery of the resurrection, revealed to us, is a fact, and we know that not the soul, but the body will be raised; not irrational creatures, but man; not the living, but the dead; not the pious only, but the wicked also, &c.; these facts we can explain; but *how* they will occur and be actualized, we

divine natures in Christ, &c. A mystery may transcend the powers of the human understanding, but cannot contradict them.

IV. THE CAUSE OF MIRACLES.

From a contemplation of the works of creation and the established course of nature, and especially from the sacred Scriptures, we learn that God is an essence possessed of free will and power, who could have made nature, and all created things, different from what he did, and could operate in and through them, differently from what he does. And this freedom of will and power, he actually demonstrates by preserving and governing the world, and all things in the world, by operating *in,* with,† and through‡* nature, according to an established law, and also by occasionally producing effects of a supernatural and extraordinary character, *without,|| above,§*

cannot comprehend. Revelation furnishes us with the facts, but not the modes of a mystery, and these facts are sufficient, without a knowledge of the modes, to serve as a foundation for belief. We act upon the same principle in nature. We know the *fact* that food is, by a certain process, converted into flesh and blood; but we do not know *how* this is done. Now the man would act very foolish, if he should refuse to eat, because he understood not the mode in which food is turned into blood, &c. The fact is sufficient for all necessary purposes.

* God operates *in nature* and created things; for, besides God, who alone is an independent being and the creator of all things, nothing can, by its own power, maintain existence, but everything would, without his sustaining power, sink back into non-existence. Hence the totality of nature and created things, are dependent on God, as well for their preservation as their creation, for "by him all things consist," or are sustained, Col. 1: 17, "he upholdeth all things by the word of his power," Heb. 1: 3, and "he worketh all in all." 1 Cor. 12: 6.

† God works *with nature* by concurring or co-operating, by his immediate influence, with the natural powers and actions of created things and beings, in so far as they do not misemploy their liberty and power.

‡ God operates *through nature*, as a means or instrument, by which he dispenses his blessings or executes his judgments.

|| God works *without nature* and its ordinary laws and powers, when he produces in a body an immediate effect, to the production of which, neither the body's own natural powers, nor anything else without it, could have contributed anything, as, e. g., to make a dead body alive, to cure instantaneously an absent sick person, &c. Effects like these are produced alone by Divine power, without any natural means, i. e., without the ordinary laws and powers of nature.

§ God operates *above* the ordinary powers and laws of nature, when he produces in a body a mediate effect. In this instance, the body's own natural powers, or the natural powers of the means employed, are engaged in the production of the effect; but at the same time these natu-

and *beyond** the ordinary course and powers of nature.† These supernatural effects are miracles, wrought by Almighty God, whenever and wherever he, in his infinite wisdom, sees fit, Ps. 115: 3. Hence the sacred writers ascribe the performing of wonders, or the working of miracles to God alone, Exod. 15: 11; Ps. 72: 18; Ps. 86: 10; Ps. 136: 4; 1 Cor. 12: 6, and that, as he has revealed himself, in the three different persons, not only as God the Father, but also as God the Son, John 5: 17, 20, 21; 14: 11; 20: 30, 31; Acts 10: 38; 4: 30; 3: 6; 9: 34, and God the Holy Ghost, to whom the working of miracles is especially ascribed, 1 Cor. 12: 7—11; Heb. 2: 4.

As a being possessed of free-will, God sometimes wrought miracles without means, but more generally by means. Hence

real powers are elevated and perfected by the higher power of God, so that an effect is produced, far greater and much more glorious than the natural powers could have produced of themselves, as, e. g., water made sweet by casting certain wood into it, Exod. 15: 25, Naaman healed of leprosy by washing himself in Jordan, 2 Kings 4: 32—35, Elijah fed by ravens, 1 Kings 17: 4—6, Samson carrying away the gates of Gaza, and killing a lion, Judges 14: 6; 16: 3, &c. Of itself, wood cannot make bitter water sweet, washing cannot cure leprosy, ravens do not naturally feed men, and no one has strength to carry away large city gates and kill a lion. Hence, in these cases, God supplemented the natural powers of the means or instruments by his higher power.

* God operates *beyond* the ordinary powers and laws of nature, when he produces in a body an effect, which is wholly beyond the natural powers of that body, or the natural powers of the means employed, as, e. g., to cause iron to swim in water, 2 Kings 6: 4—7, or angels to speak, Num. 22: 28—30.

† The laws of nature, or the modes of God's operation in nature, are twofold: 1.) The laws according to which the material world is uniformly controlled, and 2.) The laws of mental action, as to think, imagine, will, &c. When, however, such operations occur in the soul as are not grounded in the powers of the soul, and can therefore not proceed from it, then such operations or effects are miracles, and belong to the kingdom of grace, as, a.) The ordinary operations of God, by his grace in the soul, in the work of conversion, where, by means of his word, he enlightens the understanding, sanctifies the will and changes the heart. This is beyond the natural powers of the soul, and is, therefore, a supernatural effect, beyond the ordinary powers and laws of nature, though not without and contrary to the powers of the soul. It is an ordinary and usual effect, produced according to the method or law, not of nature, but of grace. In converting a soul, God employs means; the natural powers of the soul are not destroyed in conversion, but they are changed, sanctified and elevated. b.) The extraordinary operations of God in the soul, consist in those peculiar graces and gifts, which he conferred on some individuals, as immediate revelation and inspiration on the prophets and apostles.

some miracles are immediate effects produced by God without the intervention of second causes; but most of them are immediate effects, produced by God through the instrumentality of created things, or second causes. These second causes or agencies were not, of themselves, able to produce the miracles, though we may reasonably suppose they contributed what powers they possessed, to their production.* The second causes, or instruments by which God usually wrought miracles, were either, 1.) Intelligent agents, or, 2.) Mere things.

1. The intelligent agents were, 1.) *Holy Angels*, e. g., Exod. 12: 12; Ps. 78: 49; “*evil angels*,” in this latter passage, are not *bad angels*, but angels of plagues or suffering to the Egyptians, 2 Sam. 24: 16; Isa. 37: 36; Dan. 6: 22;

* The importance of the subject, and the lucid manner in which it is discussed, will justify the following somewhat extended extract from that able work of Dr. Buchanan, *Modern Atheism*. Boston: pp. 260, 261:— “This theory [of instrumental causes] has assumed two distinct and very different forms. In the first, all natural effects are ascribed to powers *imparted* to created beings, and *inherent* in them; that is, to powers which are supposed to have been conferred at the era of Creation, and to be still sustained by God’s will in Providence, subject, however, to be suspended or revoked according to his pleasure. In the second, which resembles in some respects the doctrine of ‘occasional causes,’ all natural effects are ascribed to powers not *imparted*, but *impressed*, not belonging to the natural agent, but communicated by impulse *ab extra*; and God’s will is represented as the only efficient cause of nature. In both forms of the theory, the agency of God and the instrumentality of natural means are, in a certain sense, acknowledged; but in the *former*, the second causes are apt to be regarded as if they were self-existent and independent of God; in the *latter*, second causes are apt to be virtually annulled, and all events to be regarded as the immediate effects of Divine volition. Both extremes are dangerous. For, on the one hand, the operation of second causes cannot be regarded as necessary and independent, without severing the tie which connects the created universe with the will of the Supreme; and, on the other hand, the operation of second causes cannot be excluded or denied, without virtually making God’s will the *only efficient cause*, and thereby charging directly and immediately on Him, not only all the physical changes which occur in nature, but also all the volitions and actions of His creatures. In order to guard against these opposite and dangerous extremes, we must hold the real existence and actual operation of ‘second causes;’ while we are careful, at the same time, to show both that whatever powers belong to any created being, were originally conferred by God, and also that they are still preserved and perpetuated by Him, subject to his control, and liable to be suspended or revoked, according to the pleasure of His will. We would thus have *one First*, and *many second causes*; the former *supreme*, the latter *subordinate*; really distinct, but not equally independent, since ‘second causes’ are, from their very nature, subject to the dominion and control of that Omnipotent Mind which called them into being, and which knows how to overrule them all for the accomplishment of His great designs.”

John 5: 4; Acts 12: 7—9. 2.) *Holy Men*, as Moses, Joshua, the Prophets, Samuel, Elijah, Elisha, &c., and the Apostles, Matt. 10: 1—8, e. g., Peter, Acts 3: 6, 7; 5: 9—12, Stephen, Acts 6: 8, Philip, Acts 8: 6—8, Paul, Acts 13: 11; 19: 11, 12; 20: 10, and Barnabas, Acts 14: 3; 15: 4, 12, the seventy disciples, 10: 17—19, and other believers, who were, in the apostolic age, endowed with miraculous powers or gifts, Mark 16: 17.*

* These miraculous gifts, Paul divides into two classes: 1. *Χαρίσματα, dona*, spiritual gifts, 1 Cor. 12: 4; Rom. 12: 6, λόγος σοφίας, the word of wisdom, λόγος γνώσεως, the word of knowledge, 1 Cor. 12: 8, πίστης, faith in a special and extraordinary degree, a miraculous and heroic faith, comp. 1 Cor. 12: 9, with 1 Cor. 13: 1, 2, also *προφητεία, prophesy, iαμάτα, gifts or powers of healing, and γένη γλωσσῶν, diversities of tongues, 1 Cor. 12: 9, 10, 28, 30.* 2. *Ἐνεργήματα ἐνεργήματα δυνάμεων, miraculous powers or operations, 1 Cor. 12: 6, 10, 28.* Though these miraculous gifts were, in the early stage of Christianity, especially conferred on the apostles, Matt. 10: 8; Mark 3: 15; 16: 20; Acts 2: 4, so that Paul had, in this respect, the pre-eminence over other Christians at Corinth, 1 Cor. 14: 18; 2 Cor. 12: 12, still, besides the apostles, God appointed many others to aid in propagating Christianity, whom he endowed with diverse miraculous gifts. The *Prophets* were particularly endowed with the gift of explaining mysteries and revealing future events, Acts 11: 27, 28; 21: 4, 9, 10, 11. In rank they were inferior to the apostles, because they possessed not the gift of diversity of tongues, and were only wrought upon by the Holy Ghost when something was to be revealed, comp. Num. 11: 25; 2 Kings 3: 15. The *Teachers* instructed the people in a simple manner, and were distinguished from the apostles and prophets in not having received, 1.) An immediate call like the apostles did, who saw Jesus, and were immediately instructed by him, and appointed to the apostolic office, and therefore taught with plenary authority, as, e. g., Paul was especially appointed to be the apostle of the Gentiles, 1 Tim. 2: 7; 2 Tim. 1: 11. On the contrary, these teachers were appointed by the apostles, as, e. g., Timothy and Titus, Acts 14: 23; 2 Tim. 1: 13; 2: 14, 15, 24; 3: 10, 14; 4: 2, 3; 1 Tim. 4: 13—16; 5: 21, 22; 6: 11, 12, 20, by whom, in turn, others were appointed, 2 Tim. 1: 3; 2 Tim. 2: 2; Titus 1: 5, 9. 2.) They did not, like the apostles, possess all the miraculous gifts, nor, like the prophets, such a deep knowledge of the Divine mysteries, and, 3.) They abode at one place, and did not, like the apostles, travel everywhere, preaching the Gospel, and exercising a general supervision over the whole church. The *workers of miracles*, 1 Cor. 12: 10, cast out devils, made the dead alive, removed mountains, trod on serpents and scorpions without harm, drank what was poisonous without injury, and, like Moses in Egypt, they could perform terrible things in punishment of the wicked. Next in order were the *gifts of healing—Helps*, those who waited upon the sick, &c., 1 Cor. 12: 28. *Rulers or Deacons* of the church, who maintained good order and wholesome discipline, &c., comp. Rom. 12: 7, 8. After the permanent establishment of Christianity, these peculiar miraculous gifts gradually ceased.

2. The things which God often employed, as means, in the working of miracles, are either, 1.) *Coöperating means*, which contributed whatever powers belonged to them, and to these natural powers of second causes, was superadded the higher power of God, so that an effect was produced far greater and much more glorious than could have been produced by the natural powers of the means or second causes alone, as the warmth of the prophet's body, 2 Kings 4: 34, the wind bringing quails innumerable, Num. 11: 31, the thunder, hail and fire in Egypt, Exod. 9: 23, Jacob's rods, Gen. 30: 37, and also Divine revelations by means of dreams, where the powers of the imagination, according to its law, often coöperated, Danl. 2: 1, comp. v. 9; Gen. 41: 1—8. Or, 2.) *Means which could in no way contribute anything towards the production of the effect proposed*, as the rod of Moses, Exod. 7: 20; 8: 5—18; Num. 20: 11, the mantle of Elijah, 2 Kings 2: 8, 14, the shadow of Peter, Acts 5: 15, the handkerchiefs of Paul, Acts 19: 12, also the casting of wood into bitter water, Exod. 15: 24, 25, the sprinkling of the ashes of a furnace towards heaven to produce boils and blains, Exod. 9: 8, 9, Elisha casting meal into a pot to render unwholesome food harmless, 2 Kings 4: 40, 41, and Naaman, the leper, dipping himself seven times in Jordan to cure leprosy, 2 Kings 5: 14. Or, 3.) *Means in every way unfavorable*, so that, when viewed in a natural way, they were much more obstructive than helpful to the production of the desired effect, as Elijah pouring water on the wood and sacrifice at the very time they were to be set on fire from heaven, 1 Kings 18: 34—38, Elisha casting salt in a spring of water to heal it, 2 Kings 2: 19—22, the anointing of the blind man's eyes with clay, John 9: 6, and, as some suppose, the lump of figs laid on the boil of Hezekiah, 2 Kings 20: 7, 8.

Though we cannot, at least in this life, fully understand the essence or nature of a spirit, and therefore cannot definitely determine what a finite spirit can do, or what exceeds its power; still, we are clearly taught by the light of Divine revelation, that the angels, both good, Ps. 103: 20; 2 Kings 19: 35, and bad, Matt. 4: 5—8; Luke 11: 21, are possessed of great natural powers, and that especially the devil, as a prince, who rules in the air, and is the god of this world, "worketh in the children of disobedience," Eph. 2: 2; 2 Cor. 4: 4; John 8: 44. Hence Satan may perform *opera mira*, wonderful works; but these works are far from being *miracula*, genuine miracles. For if it were true that Satan could

work *real* miracles, then it would follow that he could also make something out of nothing, raise the dead, give sight to persons born blind, &c.; but works like these exceed his power, John 10: 21. And as, on the one hand, the good angels do nothing without the will and command of God, Ps. 103: 20; so, on the other hand, the power of evil spirits is restrained, and they can do nothing without the permission of God, Exod. 8: 18; Job 1: 12; 2: 6; Matt. 8: 31, 32; Rev. 9: 14. Within this limited sphere, by the exercise of his natural powers, Satan does however many things, either,—1.) *Immediately*, as when he “smote Job with sore boils,” Job 2: 7, troubled king Saul, 1 Sam. 16: 14, bound a daughter of Abraham for eighteen years, Luke 13: 11—16, and worked especially in those whom he possessed, or, 2.) *By means or agents*, according to the general dominion he has over all the unconverted, and especially those who stand in close communion with evil spirits, as sorcerers, Exod. 7: 11, 22; 1 Sam. 28: 7 seq.; Acts 8: 9—11; 13: 7, 8, false prophets, 1 Kings 22: 22, 23; Deut. 13: 1, 2; Matt. 7: 22; 24: 24, and other wicked persons, comp. Job 1: 15, 17, with v. 12, by means of living animals, Gen. 3: 1; Matt. 8: 32, and also by inanimate things, Job 1: 16, 19, comp. v. 12.

V. REALITY OF MIRACLES.

The reality and credibility of miracles cannot be questioned by those who believe that there is a God, and that he is almighty, and doeth whatsoever seemeth good in his sight. We notice some popular objections, that have at different times been urged against miracles, and that might possibly lead the unwary astray. These objections we will state and answer briefly.

OBJECTION 1. Who can be assured that that is true which the Bible says respecting miracles?

REPLY. 1. The existence of God, whose prerogative it is to work miracles, and the authenticity of the sacred Scriptures, and the truth of the Christian religion founded on them, have been proved to the satisfaction of reasonable men. 2.) The authenticity or truth of the Old Testament is founded mainly on the writings of Moses, as the source of Divine doctrines and true religion. But that Moses was the oldest, and therefore a writer of truth (for none wrote that early, and therefore none can at least contradict Moses), and not a deceiver, as infidels say, can, among other evidences, be proved by the fact, a.) That the history which Moses wrote,

and the religion which he revived, were, at the time, well known facts, which the children of Israel had received from their ancestors as indubitable. And there can be no doubt that, in the days of Moses, some of the elders still lived, who had seen Joseph; Joseph saw his grandfather, Isaac; Isaac was born fifty years before the death of Shem; Shem was born nearly one hundred years before the death of Methuselah; and Methuselah was born more than thirty years before the death of Adam. Thus, in the days of Moses, the history of the creation could be known, being removed only five or six generations from Adam. *b.*) That Moses performed his miracles in the presence of the whole nation of the Israelites, and had they detected any fraud on the part of Moses, they would doubtless have exposed it; for, on other grounds, they often murmured against him, but of practicing deception they could not, and never did, accuse him. *y.*) That even heathen writers approve the history of Moses, and make mention of the miracles he wrought, *vide Euseb. Lib. 9; praeparat. evang. c. 8*; also *Pliny, Justin* and *Apulejus*. *3.* The authenticity of the New Testament is based chiefly on the history of the Evangelists, and is proved by the fact, *a.*) That the history of Jesus, and the miracles he wrought, were so well known, that both Jewish and heathen historians* concurred with the Christian writers, in testifying to the reality of them. And the Turks, in their Koran, believe not only that Christ really wrought miracles, but ascribe also to him, most of those which their false prophet, Mohammed, gathered from unreliable traditions or apocryphal books. The Jews also admit that Jesus of Nazareth performed the miracles which Christians ascribe to him. And, *b.*) in the accounts of miracles, and especially of those wrought by Jesus, not a single circumstance is mentioned, that does not bear the impress of truth.

OBJECTION 2. *Who can tell but all that the Bible says about miracles, took place in conformity to the established laws of nature?* Spinoza and his followers suppose that what are in Scripture called miracles, were only uncommon effects produced by the latent powers of nature, and that, because no one knows all the powers of nature, nor can explain such uncommon effects, they were by the vulgar regarded as supernatural.

* *Josephus Antiq. B. 18, c. 3; Celsus, Porphyry, Hierocles, and Julian; Tertull. Apolog. c. 5 and 18; Origen contra Cels. L. 2. c. 48.*

REPLY. 1. If miracles were mere natural effects, or the product of the latent powers of nature, the apostles would not ascribe them to the Holy Ghost as their efficient cause, 1 Cor. 12: 1, 7; 14: 12; Heb. 2: 4, comp. John 7: 39; Acts 19: 11; 2: 22; 3: 12—16; 4: 30; 4: 3, 8—15; Mark 16: 20; Rom. 15: 18, 19. 2. The supposition that every thing takes place absolutely and necessarily according to the unchangeable laws of nature, and that God cannot possibly do anything above and beyond nature, without acting against himself, rests upon the false and dangerous ground that God and nature are one and the same; but this cannot be proved; on the contrary, God, the author of nature and nature itself, are as different as creator and creature, or the maker and the thing made. God is supreme, nature is subordinate; God is independent, nature is dependent on him, and controlled by him. 3. To appeal to so-called latent powers of nature, is such an *asylum ignorantiae*, that no wise man can retreat to it with honor. 4. Though we cannot know the extent of all the powers of second causes, or of the totality of nature, still we know the general qualities or properties of innumerable natural things, and from these properties we are forced to infer what effects are above nature, and can therefore not proceed from its powers. Thus, the eye-witnesses of the miracles, perceived by all their senses, and were convinced in their understandings, that those supernatural effects which they beheld, could not have been produced by any natural or second cause, but must have been brought about by the direct Divine interposition. Hence, while we must not, on the one hand, consider every strange or unusual effect a miracle, we must not, on the other hand, hold actual miracles to be mere natural occurrences. And, besides, it is much easier to conceive that the Creator, whose power is unlimited, should perform miracles, than that dependent second causes should, by a latent power, produce such wonderful effects. On merely natural principles, the Biblical miracles cannot be explained. 5. As God made heaven and earth, and all things therein, out of nothing, as faith, not reason, teaches us to understand, Heb. 11: 3, so he wrought also many miracles without the coöperation of second causes, and by so doing he has clearly demonstrated, 1.) That he is not restricted to the use of means, and, 2.) That we should not cling to means, nor despair for want of them. Thus, e. g., Moses, Elijah and Christ subsisted forty days and nights without eating or drinking anything; the Israelites passed through the Red

Sea on dry ground, and for forty years in the wilderness they had no need of sowing, harvesting, digging wells, &c., for God fed them directly with manna, and furnished them with water from the rock. 6. It is true, God did more generally employ second causes or means in the working of miracles, but this he did, not because he needed them, or because the finite and natural powers of the means could, of themselves, produce a miracle or aid him, but because he intended, by their use, to show that he was the God of nature, and also to set forth so much the more strongly and strikingly, the excellency and glory of the miracle, and to awaken, in the beholders, deep reflection, provoke them to acknowledge that it is the finger of God, and cause them to "feel after the Lord and find him." Acts 17: 27.

OBJECTION 3. *Who knows but some secret acts were employed, or magic was resorted to in the production of miracles?* Such objections were blasphemously urged by the Jews, in the days of Christ. They charged him with working his miracles by the aid of Beelzebub, the prince of the devils, Matt. 12: 24—27. And the modern Jews generally unite with their Rabbies, in the Talmud, and allege that Jesus of Nazareth wrought his miracles by means of the *Shemhamphorasch*, or the ineffable name of Jehovah, which, they pretend, he secretly stole out of the temple.*

REPLY. 1. If no one can produce such secret arts, or show why they are not now in existence, then nothing is proved against miracles. 2. If Moses and Christ wrought their miracles by the secret powers of material instruments, they must have carried those instruments constantly about with them, and the people must have seen them make use of them. The Egyptian magicians withheld Moses with all their powers, and the enemies of Jesus watched him closely and constantly, and yet, amid such a great number and variety of miracles, they could not discover a single instance of deception. Judas, one of Christ's twelve disciples, was for years with his Lord and Master, saw him work his miracles, and was admitted to his private instructions, and afterwards

* Quod Christus per hoc nomen quoque miracula sua ediderit, probavit ante multos annos Purchetus. Ejus tamen fabulae illustrandae causa, hoc addo, quod apud Talmudicos reperi. Ut Christus in ea historia refertur descriptum Shemhamphorasch, (id est, nomen expositum, quod est ipsum nomen *nmw*,) inclusisse indiscissam cutem pedis, et ex templo eduxisse, ut sic per ejus vim miracula postmodum ediderit.—Buxtorff.

betrayed him. Now if Judas had known of any secret arts by which Christ wrought miracles, who can doubt that he would have betrayed such secret arts with his Master, if he had known of any? 3. It is true that the heathen were often beguiled by the magic arts of Satan; but when we consider that the miracles of Moses, the prophets, of Christ and the apostles, were never wrought without gracious and blessed effects, and with a view to the promotion of the honor of God's name and the extension of his kingdom, and, on the contrary, to the subversion and destruction of Satan's kingdom, and the conviction of men's consciences, we will readily discover that these latter wonders could not have been the work of Satan, and were not wrought by his aid, for otherwise he would have worked against himself, as Christ teaches, Luke 11: 17, 18.

OBJECTION 4. *Christ could not work miracles when requested to do so, as, e. g., Matt. 12: 38, 39; 16: 1—4; 26: 41, and when a certain effect was produced he would keep it a secret, as e. g., Matt. 8: 4, &c.*

REPLY. 1. Faith was required in those for whom miracles were to be performed, Matt. 9: 28; Mark 9: 22—24; Acts 6: 8, or, at least, a susceptibility to receive impressions from miracles was necessary. But the Scribes and Pharisees totally rejected and disbelieved Christ, and had already decided not to be convinced, and hence they would not have recognized a miracle, as such, though wrought before their very eyes; and, besides, crafty and malicious as their request was, there was in their hearts no point of contact left for religious faith to spring up, Mark 3: 2, 6. The soil of their hearts was unsusceptible. Hence Christ refused to gratify their humor, or to display his wonder-working power for those whose perverted minds could not be roused to repentance. He also saw that if he were to work miracles as they demanded, they would not believe and be converted, but would ascribe them to Satan, or seek some other explanation, Mark 2: 7. 2. Christ would not unnecessarily rouse the enmity of the Jews, Matt. 12: 13, 14, nor unnecessarily provoke a desire for miracles. Hence, in a few cases, and under certain circumstances, he forbade the miracle to be made known at the time it was wrought. But as the time of his crucifixion drew near, he wrought miracles in the very temple, and in the presence of his veriest enemies. Then *his hour had come.*

OBJECTION 5. *By the working of miracles, the worship of the true God was not secured, as, e. g., the children of Israel*

worshipped the golden calf, notwithstanding the many signs and wonders they had witnessed in Egypt, and hence miracles are useless.

REPLY. The children of Israel were sufficiently convinced of the power and glory of God, by the miracles which Moses wrought in Egypt. They worshipped the golden calf under the impression that they could, in this image, honor the true God, who had revealed himself so gloriously by his miracles. This act of idolatry proves, therefore, that they recognized the true God, and felt themselves under obligation to worship him; but it proves also that they had erroneous views of his character, Exod. 32: 4—6.

OBJECTION 6. *Miracles are contrary to experience.* This objection was advanced by Hume, and the substance of it may be stated thus: A miracle is a violation of the laws of nature; the laws of nature are known and established only by experience; and as we can derive testimony on any point whatever, only from experience, there can be no proof in favor of a miracle.

REPLY. 1. If testimony be derived only from experience, then the credulity of mankind would increase as they advance in years, or in other words, as they increase in experience, which is directly contrary to fact. 2. Upon this principle, we can never be furnished with evidence sufficient to induce belief in any event that has not come within our own observation. "With a view to free himself from this apparent absurdity, Mr. Hume attempted to justify the king of Siam as acting a rational and philosophical part, in refusing to believe, because it was contrary to his experience, that water would ever congeal. But we may easily see that the same principle would lead us to refuse assent to any new discovery whatever. In fact, we see not how, upon this principle, we can be justified in believing *anything*, however common. As there must be a first time to every occurrence, when it comes within our notice, so for that time, it must not obtain our belief, because it is not in accordance with our experience, and for that same reason, it must be precluded from all further trial, and of course, every door to improvement will be closed forever."—*Dr. Hopkins.*

VI. DESIGN OF MIRACLES.

God is an independent being possessed of infinite wisdom, "the only wise God," 1 Tim. 2: 17, and has his wise designs and reasons, why he does at times deviate from the established

order of nature, and work miracles, or produce supernatural effects.

While we cannot, with our limited capacities, find out, by searching, the unsearchable purposes and designs of God; still, guided by the light of Divine revelation, we can easily perceive that God, who "in time past revealed himself to the fathers and prophets at sundry times and in divers manners," designed by miracles to secure and maintain among men the honor and glory of his name.

1. The chief design which God had in working miracles, was to demonstrate, 1.) That he is the only true God, Exod. 7: 17; 10: 2; 1 Kings 18: 24, 36—39, "the Lord in the midst of the earth," Exod. 8: 22, and "that there is none like him in all the earth," Exod. 9: 14; 2 Kings 5: 15. 2.) That his servants were divinely called and commissioned, Num. 16: 28; 1 Kings 17: 24; 18: 36; Jer. 27: 18. 3.) That he might in this way awaken unbelievers, and thus prepare their minds for the reception of the true Divine word, John 4: 48. And, 4.) That the religion of the Bible is true, being confirmed and ratified before men by the visible and supernatural signature of God, Matt. 10: 7, 8; Mark 16: 20; Acts 4: 29, 30; 8: 6, 13; 14: 3; Rom. 15: 19; Heb. 2: 4.

2. The principal design Christ had in working his miracles was, 1.) To promote and extend God's honor and glory among men, Matt. 9: 8; 15: 31; Mark 2: 12; Luke 5: 26; 18: 43; 19: 37; John 11: 40; Acts 4: 21. 2.) To prove that he himself was the true God, John 2: 11; 5: 7; 17: 11; 9: 32, 33; 10: 36—38; 14: 10; 20: 31; Acts 10: 38. 3.) To prove more especially that he was the true Messiah and Savior of the world, Isa. 35: 4, 5; Matt. 11: 4, 5; Luke 7: 16; John 4: 42; 5: 36; 6: 14, and consequently that his doctrines were Divine truth, John 1: 50; 2: 11, 23; 3: 2; hence also the people believed so much the more readily in him, John 20: 31; 11: 45; 12: 11; Rom. 15: 18, 19. It was foretold by the prophets, Isa. 35: 4, 5, that Christ would work miracles, and that they were necessary signs of the Messianic calling. Hence, if Christ had wrought no miracles, his contemporaries could not have believed in him as the promised Messiah. Besides these designs for which Christ wrought miracles, we may add, 1.) That they were also of a *redemptive* character, and designed to counteract the blighting effects of the fall of Adam. Thus, to heal the sick, raise the dead, and cleanse the leprous, was to restore these persons to that state which they were originally designed to be

in. To feed thousands with a few loaves of bread, was an intimation of the removal of the curse of barrenness which fell on the earth with Adam's fall. Miracles were *signs* and pledges of redemption, not only to the persons immediately wrought upon, but to all others in all coming time, so that they might be encouraged to believe in Jesus as their Savior. 2. Miracles wrought by Jesus were also designed to convey *instruction* symbolically, to raise man, by the outward effect, to an apprehension of things spiritual, and to afford him a basis upon which his faith might build.

Miracles were never wrought without some good reason, and though we may not always see the reasons, we may, nevertheless, be assured that God, in his infinite wisdom, saw their necessity. Some have maintained that God would not work a miracle when he could secure his end without one. But as God is a free agent, and can do whatsoever he pleases, and is infinite in wisdom, we are unable to say what he may see to be best. Hence we find many instances where he accomplished his purposes by miracles, whilst to us it may seem that he could have secured the same end according to nature, and without miracles. Thus, the Israelites in the wilderness, we might suppose, could have obtained food and raiment in an ordinary way, by tilling the ground, raising flocks, &c.; instead of causing water to gush out from a rock, God might have led them to running streams, Gen. 21: 19; Exod. 2: 16; 15: 17; or, they could have sunk wells, as the Patriarchs did, Gen. 26: 18—22. When wine was wanting at Cana, instead of Christ supplying it miraculously, the guests might have secured some in the ordinary way, or, as Christ showed Peter where he could get tribute-money, so he might have shown the guests where to get some, in order to buy wine with it. But in these, and in many other instances, it seemed best to infinite wisdom to work miracles. And we are here taught that whilst God has restricted us to the use of means, he himself is not restricted to them.

As miracles were wrought in attestation and confirmation of the Divine doctrines which Moses and the prophets, Christ and the apostles, taught, and as we have, in addition, many prophecies fulfilled, the design of miracles is attained, and we would betray great unbelief, if we were, at this time, to demand miracles, see Luke 16: 29—31; and we may easily determine the character of the pretended miracles of papists and other errorists. Still, as the working of miracles is God's peculiar prerogative, we cannot say, positively, what

he may not do; and in fact, when we carefully observe God's wonderful dealings in his special providence, we must acknowledge that he still leads his children in a wonderful way.

VII. CRITERIA OF MIRACLES.

The miracles narrated in the Scriptures have certain criteria or marks, as evidences of the Divine interposition; and every occurrence or event, however unusual or strange it may be, that does not bear these evidences, cannot be received as a miracle. The number of criteria as evidences of genuine miracles, has been variously stated. The most important criteria are the following:

1. To be a real miracle, an occurrence must, in the very nature of the case, be unusual and *beyond* the powers of nature or second causes, Matt. 9: 33; Mark 2: 12; Luke 5: 26; John 9: 32; 10: 21, though it cannot be *contrary* to nature and God's word, but must rather tend to supplement, confirm or illustrate the truths found in both.

1. No occurrence can be received as a miracle, so long as it can be explained in a natural way, or, as long as second causes alone are adequate to its production. 2.) No occurrence can be proved to be contrary to nature, for the obvious reason, that no one knows all the powers of nature; and as nature or second causes, as well as miracles, are the work of God, we cannot suppose that he would oppose the one to the other, according to the approved canon: *Contra naturam Deus nihil agit*, i. e., God does nothing contrary to nature. 3.) To be a real miracle, an event can in no way be contrary to any truths in God's word, for God cannot contradict himself; but on the contrary, it ought to confirm and illustrate the doctrines contained in the Scriptures.

2. The person or persons by whom miracles are wrought, must be noted for their honesty, their piety and fear of God, and thus be morally incapable of fraud, intrigue or deception.

After Moses had, beforehand, announced what miracles he would work, and the Egyptian magicians had time to prepare themselves, they could with their enchantments *imitate* the first two miracles he wrought, but as they could either not obtain lice or mosquito-gnats, or could not confine them for use when they had them, their enchantments were at an end, and they confessed already in the third plague, that Moses wrought his wonders by "the finger of God." They could carry their deception no further. In like manner, Simon, the sorcerer, betrayed his dishonesty most signally by his

pride and avarice, Acts 8: 9—22. It is true, the devil and his emissaries may very artfully disguise their true character, and come as angels of light; still, if the tendency of their doctrines and the design of their lying wonders are carefully scrutinized, it will be easy to detect their villainy. The character of a tree may be known by the fruit it bears, as Christ teaches, Matt. 7: 15, 16; 1 John 4: 1. And even if we admit that some wicked persons were endowed with miraculous gifts, as it appears from Matt. 7: 22, 23, and the case of Judas Iscariot, Matt. 10: 1—8, that some were; still nothing is gained, for God never permitted such persons to use those gifts in confirmation of their errors or any false doctrines, or allowed them to abuse or misuse them; and if they had attempted to do so, there can be no doubt but God would have instantly withdrawn those gifts from them.

3. A miracle must be wrought, not in a corner and in the absence of eye-witnesses, nor in the presence of only a few credulous and interested persons, but openly and before numbers of intelligent and honest persons, yea, and before the veriest enemies, all of whom must have their eyes and attention directed to the miracle while it is wrought.

Thus Moses and the prophets, Christ and the apostles, wrought their miracles openly and publicly, in the presence of hundreds and thousands of spectators, yea, before their bitterest enemies and opposers, Exod 8: 19; Deut. 11: 7; 29: 2, 3, comp. Josh. 10: 12; Matt. 9: 8; 11: 4; 12: 24; Luke 11: 15—17; John 18: 20; 2: 9, 10; 3: 2; Acts 2: 5—12; 4: 16; 6: 7—10; 9: 42. But the pretended miracles of false prophets and the Papists, are wrought in secret, not before a large number of intelligent and disinterested persons, and therefore are to be wholly rejected as tricks of wicked men, or devices of the devil.

4. The design of true miracles is, not to excite admiration or wonder, to serve for merriment or sport, or to confirm error or substantiate a false religion, but to promote God's honor among men, to attest the Divine mission of God's servants, to convince men of the truth of the religion they are sent to establish, and to confer blessings on men, and, as a consequence, to subvert the kingdom of the devil, to reprove all lies and error, all superstition and idolatry.

Every miracle must be worthy of its author; and such as are wrought on trivial occasions, or for trivial purposes, may be set down as mere tricks, designed only to flatter power or sustain superstition, or promote erroneous doctrines. This

is the object of the most noted popish miracles, and hence they may properly be denominated *lying wonders*.

5. Miracles should be palpable to the senses, so that a correct judgment may be pronounced respecting them. They must be within the reach of the closest investigator, and wrought on objects with which we are intimately acquainted, as to exclude all possible collusion.

6. To remove all doubt as to its supernatural character, a miracle should be wrought instantaneously, so that no time may be left for the practice of imposition, as the magicians of Egypt did, nor for the misemployment of the slow process of nature.

The only instances, where miracles were wrought gradually, are the three found in Mark 7: 32, 37; 8: 23, 26; John 9: 17. These were peculiar cases, two were blind and one was deaf and had an impediment of speech, and they seem to have required peculiar treatment. Christ annointed the eyes of the blind man and touched the tongue of the dumb and deaf man, and by so arousing their senses by an external sign, he intended to excite their faith in him, to feel their dependence on him, and to seek help from him.

7. Miracles should be connected with some important event or subject of introduction. Thus, the delivery of the Israelites from Egypt, the giving of the law, &c., the birth of Christ and his life and death, &c., the founding of the church on the day of Pentecost, &c., were events with which miracles were connected.

For some additional criteria and their illustration, as well as for general information on the subject of miracles, we refer the reader to *Horn's Introduction*, &c.

Nearly seven centuries before, Isaiah foretold that Christ should be distinguished for the working of miracles and minutely specified some of the miracles he should perform, Isa. 29: 18, 19; 35: 4, 6; 61: 1. According to these prophecies, miracles were essentially necessary as proofs of the Messianic calling, and John the Baptist as well as the Jews generally expected that Christ would work miracles. Hence, in answer to the inquiries of the disciples of John the Baptist, Christ directs them to his miracles, as proof that he was the promised Messiah, and thus removed all suspicion of any design to impose on the understandings of men, to sway them by the power of novelty, or to surprise them by a species of proof of which they had never before heard, Matt. 11: 3, 5; Mark 7: 37. As the miracles of Christ corresponded exactly

with the prophecies going before, the Jewish people could know for certain that he was "that great prophet that should come into the world," Luke 7: 16; John 3: 2; 6: 14; Comp. Deut. 18: 15, 18.

In the miracles of Christ, as contrasted with those of Moses, the prophets and apostles, we notice some peculiarities, which challenge our attention.

1. Christ wrought his miracles directly by his own power, and this, by the way, is an important evidence of his deity. His language is: "*I* will, be thou clean;" "*I* say unto thee, arise," &c. On the contrary, Moses and the prophets wrought their miracles by the delegated power of the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, Exod. 4: 4, and the apostles did theirs in the name of Jesus, as, "In the name of Jesus of Nazareth, rise up and walk;" "Eneas, Jesus Christ maketh thee whole," &c.—Acts 3: 12, 16; 9: 34; 13: 11; 16: 18; 19: 11, 12. 2. In Christ the power of working miracles was permanent and unbroken, and whenever he would he could exercise it, because he was God-man. But as this power was merely communicated to Moses and the apostles, whenever infinite Wisdom saw necessary, so the exercise of it by them was temporary. 3. In about three years and a half, Christ alone wrought more miracles than Moses and all the prophets and apostles did. Great multitudes flocked to him, and he cured them of various diseases; thousands he fed with a few loaves of bread, Matt. 8: 16; Mark 6: 44, 56; Luke 7: 21. And these miracles he performed not only on men, but on various objects, as, on water, Matt. 14: 24—30, wind, Matt. 8: 23—26, trees, Matt. 21: 19, fish, Luke 5: 4—6, the dead and living, in heaven and on earth, and under various circumstances, John 20: 30, 31; 21: 25. 4. Christ manifested his surpassing benevolence in all the miracles he wrought. He never inflicted punishment, or made any one suffer by his miracles. When the disciples would have fire come down from heaven upon the wicked, he rebuked them, Luke 9: 54—56. Moses in Egypt and in the wilderness, under God, inflicted sore punishment by miracles; so did the prophets; and so did the apostles often, e. g., the death of Ananias and Sapphira, Elymas smitten with blindness, &c. But Christ healed the sick, cured the lame, made the maimed whole, gave sight to the blind and hearing to the deaf, made the dumb speak, raised the dead, preached the Gospel to the poor, and went about doing good. Christ wrought no miracles for his own

benefit or comfort. When others had no wine to drink, then he turned water into wine, John 2: 3—10; but when he was athirst, then he requested a Samaritan woman to give him water to drink, John 4: 6, 7; when others were hungry, then he fed them miraculously; but when he was hungry, then he cursed the fig-tree, when he could have made it yield fruit immediately, Matt. 21: 19; Mark 11: 12—14. 5. The Lord Jesus displayed his infinite wisdom in commencing his miracles by furnishing nourishment for the body, John 2: 1—10. Thus, faith in him was aroused. Afterwards, therefore, he manifested his power in healing the sick, and, finally, in raising the dead. Sometimes he wrought one miracle as a prelude to another and much more glorious one, as, e. g., the healing of the centurion's servant was followed, on the next day, by the raising of the widow's only son, at Nain, Luke 7: 2, 15; the healing of the woman "which had an issue of blood twelve years," was followed by the raising of Jairus' little daughter from the dead, Mark 5: 22—43. 6. By all his miracles Christ conferred great blessings on soul and body. He fed the hungry, healed the sick, raised the dead, &c., and as for the soul, he called unbelievers to repentance, or prepared them for the exercise of a living faith.

OBJECTION. By his miracles, Christ destroyed the swine of the Gergesenes, and withered the fig-tree in the way, Matt. 8: 28—32; 21: 19.

REPLY. 1.) The devils requested; and Christ permitted them, to go into the swine; they drove the swine into the sea, and therefore were responsible for their destruction. 2.) The fig-tree stood in the way, probably in the public road, and therefore belonged to no one, and by its destruction no one was injured.

All these peculiarities in the miracles of Christ, when viewed in connection, tend powerfully to convince the mind of his Divine mission, and the truth of his doctrines. For when we consider that no mere human or finite being could have wrought miracles so numerous, great and various, "except God be with him," John 3: 2, and that it is impossible to conceive, and still less to believe that a righteous, holy and good God would, with his constant and almighty power, aid the vilest impostor (for Jesus must have been such, if he was not the true Messiah, as he claimed to be) in deceiving so many, many precious souls. On the contrary, we know that God did, many hundred years before, by the holy prophets, indicate and pronounce miracles to be a certain sign or crite-

tion by which the true Messiah should be known. Besides, no impartial, unprejudiced mind, can possibly regard these miracles otherwise than as infallible credentials of the Divine mission of Jesus, and his Messianic mediatorial office, especially as all other evidences harmonize with that of miracles to prove this true, and consequently we must receive all that he taught concerning his person and the way of salvation, as infallible, Divine truth.

The miracles of the Old Testament, as contrasted with those of the New, and especially those of Jesus Christ, exhibit some interesting peculiarities. 1. It seems the Old Testament miracles were wrought, generally, with more difficulty than those of the New, not because God was less powerful, but because the Old Testament dispensation was less glorious, and the bestowal of miraculous power less copious. Thus, in the healing of leprosy, Moses wrestles and pleads with God for Miriam, and says, "Heal her now, O God, I beseech thee," Num. 12: 13; Christ merely touches the leper and says, "I will, be thou clean," Matt. 8: 3. The prophet "besought the Lord" and entreated God to restore the withered hand of king Jeroboam, 1 Kings 13: 1-6; but to the man with the withered hand, Jesus simply said, "Stretch forth thine hand, and it was restored whole," Matt. 12: 12. To restore to life the son of the widow at Zarephath, Elijah prays long, and stretches himself three times upon the child before its life returns, 1 Kings 17: 19-22; Jesus cries, "Lazarus, come forth," John 11: 43. So Elisha also labors long and hard to bring back the life of the Shunammite's child, 2 Kings 4: 32-35; Christ said to Jairus' daughter, "Damsel, arise," Mark 5: 41. Elijah sent his servant seven times before the heaven was black with clouds and wind and rain, 1 Kings 18: 45; on the contrary, Christ hushed the wind and waves with a word, Matt. 8: 26. 2. The miracles of the Old Testament seem to have been in closer contact with external nature than those of the New. They were generally more startling and terrific, massive and portentous, corresponding with the "fiery law," Deut. 33: 2, and severity of the old dispensation. There was thunder and lightning, the sweeping storm and sounding trumpet, fire and hail, the rending earthquake and smoking mountain. On the contrary, in the miracles of the New Testament, we hear the "still small voice." They related more to man's soul than his body, and gave evidence of a new, nobler, and more glorious dispensation.

It may also be observed, that miracles usually mark and cluster around each great epoch or crisis in the progress of the history of the church of God. Thus, in the establishment of the Jewish economy, miracles were wrought by Moses and Joshua, because it was the beginning of a new epoch. And in the days of Elijah and Elisha, when the church was reclaimed from her backslidings, miracles were wrought. So also during the captivity at Babylon. And when God was manifested in the flesh, an event so great and remarkable, and the commencement of a new epoch, it might be expected that such an occurrence would be marked by great and glorious displays of miraculous powers. And so it was. At such times infinite Wisdom saw it necessary to bestow miraculous gifts in a large measure. And miracles might at each crisis be expected; but it is not to be expected that miracles should be wrought when no such necessity exists for them.

VIII. DIFFERENT KINDS OF MIRACLES.

Not every thing that is strange, wonderful or unusual, is a miracle. We must, therefore, carefully distinguish *real* miracles from *fictitious* ones. God alone is the author of the *former*; but the *latter* are mysterious effects produced by the natural power of the devil, and are therefore not *real* miracles. For although they are called *σημεῖα καὶ τίματα*, signs and wonders, Matt. 24: 24; Rev. 13: 13, still, they are only *lying* signs and wonders, 2 Thess. 2: 9, because they originally proceed from the father of lies, John 8: 44, and are designed only to deceive men, and seduce them to embrace false doctrines, Deut. 13: 1-3.

There are four kinds of *fictitious* miracles. 1. Such as are evidently false. These are very common among the heathen, ancient (*vide* Lactantius, L. 2, c. 16, comp. Tertullian, Apol. c. 22, 23,) and modern, the Mohammedans, Greeks and Roman Catholics. 2. Such as are wrought by sleight of hand or dexterity. These are artful tricks practiced by jugglers, rope-dancers, and also by the heathen, Mohammedans and Roman Catholic priests. 3. Such as are produced by Satanic illusion and fraud, e. g., conjuration, the calling up of spirits or the souls of deceased persons (1 Sam. 28: 7-16) by various magic arts, signs, ceremonies, and the muttering of strange words. To this class belong the wonders performed by the Egyptian magicians with their enchantments, and especially the change of their rods into serpents, which were not real miracles, but delusive arts of the devil produced

in opposition to Moses and the true religion. And also what is at present known as table-turning, table-dancing, and communication with the souls of deceased persons. All these things the devil originates. 4. Such as are produced by an injurious abuse of the powers of nature and natural mysteries. In this way strange effects are produced, not only by the devil, who is, as we may well suppose, an extensively experienced and practiced naturalist, and thoroughly understands the hidden attributes and powers of natural things and their application, but also by his emissaries, who often perform wonderful things. The effects thus produced are not miracles, because they are founded on and proceed from the powers of nature or second causes.

The *real* miracles may, in general, be divided into two classes, namely, into *genuine* and *spurious*. The *genuine* miracles are operations of almighty God without, above and beyond the ordinary powers and laws of nature or second causes. The *spurious* miracles are operations of almighty God in, with and through the ordinary powers and laws of nature or second causes.

1. The *genuine* miracles may be divided into *common* and *uncommon*. *Common* miracles are operations of God in and upon the human soul in the kingdom of grace—operations occurring ordinarily and constantly, though they are supernatural, because they exceed the ordinary powers of the understanding and will, as, conversion, justification, union with God, sanctification, &c. *Uncommon* miracles are operations of God in the kingdom of his omnipotence, and do not occur constantly, but seldom, and in an extraordinary manner, either for the relief, benefit and good of the pious, or the terror, punishment or destruction of the wicked.

2. The *spurious* miracles are not proper miracles, but mysteries of nature. Of these, some are mysteries to all, others are mysteries only to some. Thus, conception and gestation (Ps. 139: 13—16,) are mysteries to all, and so is the mode of the formation of every animal and plant, &c., as the most skilled naturalist must acknowledge. Ingenious inventions, chemical changes and combinations, &c., are mysteries to the vulgar generally.

IX. CLASSIFICATION OF MIRACLES.

In classifying the various miracles mentioned in the sacred Scriptures, we may view them with respect to their *cause*, or

to the *objects* on which they were wrought, or the *manner* in which they were produced.

1. With respect to their producing cause, miracles are, 1.) *Immediate* effects produced by God himself, without the use of second causes, or, they are, 2.) *Mediate* effects produced by God through second causes as means.

2. With respect to the objects, on which miracles were wrought, they may be classified into different kinds. 1.) Such as were wrought in heaven, Isa. 7: 11; Danl. 6: 27; Joel 2: 30; Acts 2: 19, or in the earth, 2.) Such as were wrought on men, as the sick, blind, lame, deaf and dumb, the possessed, and the dead, &c., or on irrational animals, as Balaam's ass, Num. 22: 28; 2 Pet. 2: 16, the ravens, 1 Kings 17: 6, &c., or on inanimate things, as water, Exod. 7: 20, fire, Dan. 3: 27, wind and sea, Matt. 8: 27, trees, Matt. 21: 19, 20, &c.

3. With respect to the manner in which miracles were produced, they may be divided into two classes. 1.) Some miracles are of such a character, that they never do or can occur according to the ordinary course of nature. These are miracles of the first class, and are always miracles. 2.) But other miracles are of such a character, that an effect like them may be, and often is produced according to the ordinary course of nature, but not under the same circumstances, and in the same manner as the Scriptures say they were produced, and hence these are miracles of the second class. We must, however, not suppose that the miracles of the second class are less important than those of the first. For both are supernatural effects, and the production of those of the one class, required as much power as those of the other class, namely, Divine power, and consequently, the one were as easy or hard to produce as the other.

1. Among the miracles of the first class, which never do or can occur according to the ordinary course of nature, and therefore must always be miracles, we find, first of all, the creation of the world and all things out of nothing. This is the first miracle, and the basis of all the natural and supernatural operations of the almighty Creator. To this class belong the following miracles: The change of the rod of Moses into a serpent,* Exod. 7: 9, 10, the dividing of the

* To change one thing into another, in this way, is a creative act, which the devil can only *imitate*, by his agents, through the performance of delusive tricks.

waters of the Red Sea, Exod. 14: 22, the speaking of Balaam's ass,* Num. 22: 28, the dividing of the waters of Jordan in the days of Joshua, and Elijah and Elisha, Joshua 3: 16; 2 Kings 2: 8, 14, the sun and moon standing still, Joshua 10: 12, 13, the barrel of meal and cruse of oil, which failed not,† 1 Kings 17: 16, the raising of the dead by Elijah and Elisha, 1 Kings 17: 21, 22; 2 Kings 4: 32—35, the iron swimming in water, 2 Kings 6: 5—7, the return of the shadow on the dial of king Ahaz, 2 Kings 20: 11, the un-consuming fire in the furnace at Babylon, Danl. 3: 20—27, Jonah preserved alive in the whale's belly, Jona 1: 15, comp. 2: 10. And in the New Testament: the conception of the virgin, Matt. 1: 18, the feeding of thousands with a few loaves of bread, Matt. 14: 21, the instant cure of the absent sick, giving sight to those born blind, hearing and speech to the deaf and dumb, limbs to the maimed, Matt. 12: 22; 11: 5; 8: 13, and the raising of the dead in the days of Christ and the apostles, Luke 7: 11—17; John 11: 43, 44; Acts 9: 36—39.

2. The miracles of the second class are more numerous than those of the first, and are of such a character that events like them occur also according to the ordinary course of nature, but not in the same way and under the same circumstances as these miracles are said to have occurred, and therefore they are not natural, but supernatural effects, as the sleep which God caused to fall on Adam,‡ Gen. 2: 21, the gathering of all animals to Adam, Gen. 2: 19, and to Noah in the ark,§ Gen. 7: 8, 9, the flood,|| Gen. 7: 11, 12, the rain

* Parrots, ravens and some other creatures, may be taught to give forth something like the human voice and articulate sounds, but for an ass to do so is a miracle.

† Hero creative power was exerted; for such an incessant increase in such a time, was wholly beyond nature.

‡ For a person to fall into a deep sleep is natural; but in the case of Adam, every circumstance goes to show that it was not a merely so-called somnolency or lethargy, but something wholly peculiar and supernatural, because in a state of innocence, Adam was perfectly exempt from all kinds of disease, and had no need of sleep, and because when he awoke from this sleep he found no change in body or mind—his body was whole and sound. With the sleep of Adam some compare the sleep of Abraham, Gen. 15: 12, and of Saul's body-guard, 1 Sam. 26: 12.

§ Sometimes animals collect in herds, or are driven together by men, or are brought to one place by the weather, &c.; but none of these causes could have operated here, or been adequate to the result.

|| Great floods, much rain, thunder and lightning, earthquakes and volcanic eruptions, and such like terrible occurrences are common in

of fire and brimstone upon Sodom and Gomorrah, Gen. 19, the rain and "grievous hail" in Egypt, Exod. 19: 18, 23, and in the days of Joshua, Joshua 10: 11, the "thunderings and lightnings" on mount Sinai, Exod. 20: 18, and in the days of Samuel, 1 Sam. 12: 17, 18, the cleaving of the earth and the swallowing up of Korah and his party, Num. 16: 30—33, and the earthquake at Christ's crucifixion, Matt. 27: 51, 52, and when Paul was in prison at Philippi, Acts 17: 26, the burning but unconsumed bush in mount Horeb,* Exod. 3: 2, the turning of water into blood, Exod. 7: 20, the immense number of frogs, lice, flies, &c., in Egypt, Exod. 8: 4—22, the swarms of locusts, and darkness in Egypt, Exod. 10, and the darkness at the crucifixion of Christ, Matt. 27: 25, the pillar of cloud and fire, Exod. 13: 21, the bitter waters of Marah healed, Exod. 15: 23—25, and the unwholesome water at Jericho cured, 2 Kings 2: 19—22, the rock smitten in the wilderness, Exod. 17: 6, the great number of quails, Exod. 16: 3, the rod of Aaron blossoming,† Num. 17: 8, the raiment of the Israelites not waxing old,‡ Deut. 8: 4, the fall of manna in the wilderness,§ Exod. 16: 14—17, the kine of the Philistines, 1 Sam. 6: 7, 8, the overthrow of the walls of Jericho, Joshua 6: 20, the great drought in the days of Elijah, 1 Kings 17: 1, Elijah fed by ravens,|| 1 Kings 17: 6, the star in the east,¶ Matt. 2: 9, the ability to con-

nature, but one or all of these will not account for the universal flood in the days of Noah.

* In nature there are gases which burn, but do not consume, as *ignis fatuus*, *ignis lambens*, &c. But none of these will explain the miracle of the burning but unconsumed bush.

† That vegetables may, by artificial heat, be forced, so that in one night they will put forth leaves, blossoms, and, in some instances, even fruit, experiments prove abundantly; but that a dry staff or rod, when laid on a dry lid, should do so—this is a miracle wrought by God.

‡ When clothes are but seldom worn and good care taken of them, they may be preserved for a long time; but if they are constantly worn on the body, as those of the Israelites were, for forty years, and yet do not wear out, then their preservation is a miracle. Hence the Israelites were expressly reminded of this Divine interposition, in the passage we have above referred to.

§ Manna-dew, and the resinous substance exuding from a certain tree in Arabia, are natural products; but these can in no way be compared with the manna which fell in the wilderness.

|| Ravens and some other birds have been known to drop bread, fish, and other things before persons accidentally; but for ravens to feed a man constantly, and for some length of time, is a real miracle.

¶ New stars, astronomers tell us, have at long intervals made their appearance; but not in the way the star in the east did.

ceive when past age, as Sarah and Elizabeth, Gen. 18: 11; 21: 2; Luke 1: 7, 13, the turning of water into wine,* John 2: 9, the fig-tree withered, Matt. 21: 19, 20, the infliction of sudden judgment on the wicked, and other evils, as blindness, Exod. 19: 11; Acts 13: 11, pestilence, 2 Sam. 24: 15, boils and blains, Exod. 9: 9, emerods, 1 Sam. 5: 6, leprosy, Num. 12: 10; 2 Kings 5: 27, sudden death, 2 Sam. 6: 7; Acts 5: 5, 10, comp. 1 Sam. 6: 19; 1 Kings 13: 24; 20: 36; 2 Kings 1: 10; 2: 24; Lev. 10: 2, the instantaneous cure of many lepers, Luke 17: 12, and other diseased persons, Matt. 4: 24, the healing waters of the pool Bethesda,† John 5: 2—4, the bite of serpents harmless, Mark 16: 18; Acts 18: 3—5, poison innocuous, 2 Kings 4: 40, 41; Mark 16: 18, ability to speak different languages, Mark 16: 17; Acts 2: 4—11, deliverance from threatened death, as David from the hand of Saul, 1 Sam. 23: 25—28, Daniel from the lions, Danl. 6: 22, Peter from prison, Acts 12: 7, also signal victories over the enemy, as Joshua and the Judges, Jonathan and his armor-bearer, 1 Sam. 14: 6—15, Gideon, Judges 7: 22, David, 2 Sam. 5: 24, 25, the kings of Israel and Judah, 2 Kings 7: 5; 19: 35; 2 Chron. 14: 9—15, and many more wonderful occurrences, in which God manifested his special coöperation, concurrence or influence, in an extraordinary and supernatural manner among his people of old.

* All the circumstances, connected with the performance of this miracle, show that it was effected in a supernatural way, and by supernatural power. Ordinarily and in a natural way, water is annually turned into wine; for by means of its roots, the vine absorbs the moisture of the earth, which is natural, and especially rain water, and by virtue of its own peculiar nature and the concurrent influence of the air and sun, the vine turns this water into wine. This we may call a genuine miracle of nature, which no one can explain or imitate.

† Everything connected with the healing power of the water of this pool, proves that it was not natural, and cannot be compared with thermal-springs; for no natural water, whatever sanative qualities it may possess, can produce the effects and cure all the diseases which the waters of this pool did.

ARTICLE VII.

THE CHRISTIAN PRINCIPLE: ITS INFLUENCE UPON GOVERNMENT.

By Edward McPherson, A. M., Gettysburg, Pa.

A NATION'S Government is itself incarnate ; and its institutional history furnishes a fair, if not infallible, test of its distinguishing traits. Thus, who can fail to perceive, in the numerous, varying and contradictory phases of the governmental history of France the characteristic features of the French people, happily described by a great Frenchman as a people fertile in contrasts and extreme in act ; now below the level of humanity, now far above ; unchangeable in leading features, yet fickle in its daily opinions and tastes ; now hostile to subjection, now wedded to servitude ; more prone to worship chance, force, success, eclat, noise than real glory ; endowed with more heroism than virtue, more genius than common sense ; the most brilliant and the most dangerous nation of Europe ? Who, on the other hand, will not recognize in the uniform, and rarely-revolutionary development of English Institutions, the steady, careful, measured march of the methodical English ?—a people singularly unimpulsive in character, and hence barren of contrasts, moderate in action, and regular in movement ; attached to old habits, both of thought and deed, and indisposed to change them, and hence, while strongly marked by distinct characteristics, preserving a wonderful unity ; more virtuous than heroic, and more sensible than brilliant ; too wise to mistake the shadow for the substance, too sagacious to be diverted from, and too persevering to be foiled in their purposes, they have been, for ages, the freest, most substantial, most reliable and most prosperous nation of Europe. Who, likewise, will not recognize in the marvellous and unparalleled activity exhibited upon this Continent, the restless, progressive, all-daring, irreverential spirit of our people ?—a people not so mercurial as the French, nor yet as unimpressionable as the English ; with little reverence for forms, little respect for routine, and even little veneration for age, apart from its actual merits ; a composite of all nations, with marked features of each ; self-reliant, impetuous and energetic, yet generally prudent, persevering and successful—a people whose growth has amazed,

whose prosperity has confounded, and whose alleged audacity has startled the world. But let not the position of government be mistaken. It cannot confer happiness, cannot create fireside contentment, cannot produce or increase personal excellence ; for the causes of these are in the Individual. But that vast machine, of necessity, intertwines itself with the very fibres of the citizen, becomes enwrapped with his individual interests, penetrates the intricacies of social life, moulds the people and is moulded by them, and, with marked fidelity, mirrors forth their tastes, opinions and principles. Thus, where an Autocrat holds the life, liberty and property of his subjects at his will, where no legislative authority intervenes between the power-holder and people, where Courts are unknown or are the supple servants of authority, where the Church even is an adjunct of Government, and where no powerful, deep-rooted, time-honored, equalizing Institutions break the force of arbitrary power, we cannot, and do not, find in the people advanced intelligence, active intellect, elevated sentiment or a heroic nature. For neither the cultivated, the daringly intellectual, the truly home-loving, nor the naturally heroic are fit, because not passive, subjects of unlimited authority. In the opposite case, where there is no concentrated power, where there are clearly defined limits to every department, where the people have control of their laws and customs, where impregnable Institutions break up the characteristic level-plain of Despotism, we expect to find, and do find, a people advanced beyond rudimental knowledge, having tested all the dogmas of the Schools, repudiated the maxims by which cunning men have bound whole Continents, distinguished between the true and the false in morals, and fathomed their souls and sought daily to develop their hidden excellencies—a people who need liberty as they need vital air. Thus, there are Schools of Government as of Art ; and while men speak of the contrasts between Ancient, Mediæval and Modern Art, they may as truly point out the contrasts between the various Schools of Government, which have severally commanded the obedience of portions of mankind. The explanation of this is simple. Man is as an organ, many-toned and deep, whose responsive chords are ever thrilling through the great Temple of the Universe—in the gentleness of the quiet peal, the plaintiveness of the melting wail, or the joyousness of the full, grand, over-swelling chorus. The causes of this diversity are numerous. By none are they thoroughly understood. Concerning them, there

are conflicting theories. But their study can never be without interest; for who can be indifferent to those great problems, whose solution will make clear the path of human life, as it reaches back into the untraceable past, or stretches forth to the illimitable future?

I have said, there are conflicting theories touching the relative power of the forces which produce Human Progress.—One denies that the CHRISTIAN PRINCIPLE can be computed among the influences which control the movements of society. It is not denied that the influence exists and is active. But it is alleged that Religion is not a prime cause of social improvement, and has not been, as claimed, the great civilizer of the modern world; that changes of religion are in consequence of some previous advance in intelligence, and are hence dependent upon the latter; and that, in analyzing the causes which may justly be considered the motive-power of Humanity, History does not furnish the Religious Principle as one. The theory also excludes all moral influences, and claims intellectual acquisitions as the irresistible force impelling Man onward and upward. It is urged that "good feelings and good deeds die with the individual," and that the degree of civilization attained by any country, depends on the amount, the direction, and the diffusion of human knowledge. The theory also excludes feeling and passion from the list of governing influences—upon the ground that the feelings and passions of one class being antagonistic to those of another, are balanced thereby. Whence the two axiomatic conclusions—

First, That the effect of passion, good and bad, of vice as well as virtue, is in the great average of human affairs, nowhere to be seen.

Second, That the totality of human affairs is ultimately governed by the totality of human knowledge.

A commentator on this doctrine accepts most of it, but considers the passions of men as playing the largest part in the history of nations as of individuals; and that passion, allied with power, is the most formidable, and not the least permanent of the agencies which disturb or control Society. Other theories exist upon the general subject, but none of them fairly come before us in this discussion.

Knowledge is said to be the irresistible power—by which is meant intellectual acquisition, as antagonistic to moral or religious. But is it possible to dissociate entirely intellectual and moral truth? Is it possible to give our intellectual pow-

ers free range over the wide expanse of The Knowable, without thereby affording scope for the exercise of the moral sentiments? Can one side of a man move without the other? Can one-half of a man grow, and the other remain dwarfed? Can food be made to nourish one organ, and weaken another? Man's moral and intellectual natures are as intertwined as his nervous and arterial systems. One is more or less dependent upon the other. And both are regulated by the same conditions of health. Hence it may safely be asserted that a *purely* intellectual growth in a nation is a dreamer's myth. In spite of all effort, the moral nature will be invigorated or impaired by the causes which stimulate to intellectual activity. So that we might, admitting the dictum that the totality of human affairs is ultimately governed by the totality of human knowledge, still claim that the moral and religious sentiments are not thereby dethroned, because they are, of necessity, a larger or smaller part of the propelling power. But we go further. While admitting the high position of intellectual knowledge, and conceding it to be an essential power, without which little substantial progress can be expected, we deny its exclusive claim, upon the ground of its inadequacy. Man is not all intellect, nor does he, even generally, act upon the conclusions of pure reason, unmodified by his sympathies, his sense of right, of prudence and other causes. But an explanation of human conduct which fails to embrace man's whole nature must be false. The great irresistible powers controlling Man must penetrate every part of man—must reach all his powers—must be co-extensive with his nature. This, intellectual acquisition is not. It is a most valuable agent. It is indispensable to all progress. It is elevating and alleviating in its tendencies. It enlarges the circle of human enjoyments. It is the "godlike principle which distinguishes man from the brute." It gives man power over the universe. It reveals hidden things, and makes dark things plain. It solves the mysteries of the physical world, and the still greater mysteries which abound within one's self, whilst it expands Man's faculties, gives him new thoughts, and lifts him above degrading and brutalizing influences. But it is not the only power by which man is to rise. There is another, wider, deeper, broader, stronger. It is the power which the Almighty offers for man's salvation. Upon this alone, can mankind surely rest, for the true enjoyment of the present, and that bursting of agonizing bonds which we hopefully expect in the future.

It is further claimed, in support of this theory, that the passions and feelings of one part of society are balanced by those of the other part, and are hence unworthy of computation as promoting or retarding progress. Now, intelligence and ignorance are not more evenly distributed in society than good feelings and evil ones. If the latter two are considered destructive of each other's influence, why may not the ignorance of one part of society be likewise deemed to destroy the influence of the intelligence of the other part? Why is it, that vice is presumed to destroy the power of virtue, in the great average of human life, and ignorance is not presumed to destroy the power of intelligence? Is there greater vitality in intelligence than in virtue, or is there less in ignorance than vice? On the contrary, real intelligence is always the companion of virtue, and ignorance is the hand-maid of vice. And the theory which annihilates the influence of the one while permitting the influence of the other, must necessarily be false. For it were as sound to consider the sun and light, the night and darkness, or the tree and its fruit, mutually destructive.

It is further alleged that Religion has always varied with the amount of enlightenment in the age, that its truths were early acquired and have had little comparative influence, and that their operation was more direct and universal in the simpler than it can be in the present more complex stages of society. Religion cannot thus be reasoned out of existence. It has found many enemies, by whom its progress has been retarded. It has struggled long and painfully, and yet struggles with the master-passions of men. It has had its fields of triumph. It has also had its temporary reverses. But it comes from God, is supported by His hand, is sustained by His power, and will be finally triumphant. It is common for men to reason from themselves to Him, yet how unwisely! Such objections to the vitality of the CHRISTIAN PRINCIPLE are well answered in these eloquent words of Guizot, applied to another subject:

"The movements of Providence are not restricted to narrow bounds; it is not anxious to deduce to-day the consequence of the premises it laid down yesterday. It may defer this for ages, till the fulness of time shall come. Its logic will not be less conclusive for reasoning slowly. Providence moves through time, as the gods of Homer through space—it makes a step, and ages have rolled away."

This theory not only implies, but openly asserts that "good feelings and good deeds die with the individual," and hence are powerless upon National character. Is this true? Individual character makes National character. We are all im-pressible by each other. No one is independent. No one's character is self-evolved; for all are modified by the associations of their daily life. We are surrounded with effective causes, which impress deeply all they reach, and they reach all. The physical world is ablaze with activities. Our homes, our walks, our resting-places, these streets, this spot, this town, yea the whole earth and the very firmament overflow with influences begun, many of them before we breathed, and daily grown more numerous and extensive, and comprehending in their reach all nature. No man can ascend above them. No man can descend below them. No man can escape them. If he flee to the desert, they are in the arid sand, the parched earth, the burning atmosphere. If to the mountains, they are in the trickling stream, the deep glen, the opening gorge. If to the uttermost parts of the earth, they are in the frigid sky, the crisp air, the very barrenness of bleakness. It is likewise in the mental and moral world. Thought does not die. Deeds, the product of thought, are made immortal by perpetual transmission. We receive thoughts into our minds, dwell upon them, and incorporate them with ourselves. They become part of us, having gone into our growth. They then live in us, and through us, in all we influence, directly or indirectly, well or ill—in our children, our friends, our acquaintances, our very enemies, and even those we know not, have never seen, and will never see, whom those may influence whom we have influenced. Nothing in nature dies. The tree is cut down and burned. But its elements enter other forms of life and live, making new combinations, which are in turn resolved—thus perpetuating change, but never destroying aught. Thus man, dead, lives in others to whom he has contributed part of himself. Upon this interdependence of one upon another, this intertwining of man with man as twig with twig, is based a most overwhelming argument in favor of personal piety—for by being otherwise, we not only drag ourselves towards perdition, but assist to hurry hundreds, perhaps thousands of others in their downward course. Thus, man in destroying himself, destroys others—in saving himself saves others. How startling the thought, and yet how true!

To assert that producing causes cease with the immediate effect produced, is to deny all analogy. Let me borrow two

illustrations. Suppose two bodies struck together, there is not merely a change of position or motion in one or both. There is not merely a sound produced. Sundry currents are produced. There is a disarrangement of the particles of the bodies in the neighborhood of the point of collision. There is a certain amount of heat evolved. In some cases, a spark results; and sometimes this is associated with chemical combinations. The lighting of a candle produces heat and light, generates an ascending column of gases, and establishes currents—each of which changes is the parent of others. The carbonic acid given off will combine with some base, or yield its carbon to a leaf. The water will modify the condition of the air. The gaseous current, striking a cold body, will be condensed, and will alter the temperature, and perhaps the chemical state, of the surface it covers. The heat melts the tallow and expands the neighboring air. By the falling of the light on various objects, various colors are produced.—These secondary actions also may be traced into ever-multiplying ramifications, until they become too minute to be appreciated. Thus it is throughout the entire world. Nothing exists for itself alone. This is a law which neither the hardness nor the softness of the object, neither its largeness nor its smallness, neither its position nor its qualities, which even human selfishness—the most corroding of all created influences—has never been able to violate or evade. Upon all things it is written, *Thou canst not live for thyself alone.* Man is not above this. Stones and trees, solids and liquids, the organic and the inorganic, as well the surface-found as the deep-buried—all, inanimate though they be, affect others and have taken, are taking, or will take part in the activities of the world of matter. If then it be true that to the material world is vouchsafed the power of mutual and never-ending influence, upon what probable grounds, and with what reasonableness can it be claimed that man's thoughts and words and deeds die with the individual? Man is not below the brute, not lower than the rock, that its speechless voice, once uttered, shall continue to grow in melody—reaching its highest harmony on the Great Day when time shall be no more—while his purest aspirations, his truest words, his noblest deeds sink forgotten and resultless with the occasion which produced them. Every man's experience repudiates the thought. A true word fitly spoken, may convict a heart, which may be the means of arousing numbers; and those, others—the circle ever widening throughout all time. Who

cannot recall a critical occasion, when a friend's injunction, long since forgotten but then remembered, when a long buried but revived expression, when a casual remark from a passer-by, when a presumed accidental occurrence, when the veriest trifle, said or done, by those we know not, has determined an event, begun a succession of effects, indefinite in number and comprehensive in extent, and has possibly fixed our own and others' destiny? Who is not, at times, oppressed with the unwelcome memory of foul words once heard, and still polluting whole channels of thought? While memory remains a faithful monitor, the past cannot be a blank; and until memory dies, nothing it has ever seized can be considered dead. As these things are true of individuals, the like may be said of nations. Great, controlling minds do not expire with the bodies in which they acted. The heroes, and warriors, and philosophers of the world, influence daily those who read the records of their achievements; and some, ages ago deceased, are more potential to-day than before their dissolution. Napoleon yet lives in France, and the magic influence of his name made Louis Napoleon President of the Republic. Loyola still lives in the insinuating, tireless, proselyting Order he founded. Voltaire, and Bolingbroke, and Shaftesbury, and Fontenelle yet number their victims by thousands. Wilberforce yet lives in the detestation of the Slave Trade, now almost universal. Calhoun still lives in the new doctrines he has stamped upon the government. Washington, and Jefferson and Hamilton; and Clay, and Webster and Adams yet live, in the affection and veneration of their countrymen, while around the names of Mary Ware and Susan Allibone, is the ever-fresh aroma of good deeds, springing from benevolent hearts made more lovely by the refining influence of an exalted piety.

But while all this may be admitted, it may still be denied that these influences, and such as these, exert a perceptible effect upon more than individual deeds, or that in the totality of the world's deeds they are appreciable. But who can define the limit within which these influences operate? They act upon men's minds, and through them upon the nation's policy. Can the domain of mind be circumscribed? Neither can the limit of that be circumscribed, by whose influence the mind makes judgment or forms a purpose. A suggestion, casually made, rouses a heroic nature to activity. His deeds mark an age, settle a policy, and found an Empire, with its

vast and varied machinery. Did the suggestion which roused the man, end with him? No; it stretched itself forward into the world's history, and carved for itself an eternal home in the great palace of Empire. Let no man, then, declare that men's deeds die with them. They are perpetuated in others—the man of to-day being the embodiment of all the thoughts thought, the feelings felt, the knowledge known by all the generations of men who have gone before. Or, as Pascal has elegantly expressed the thought: “The succession of men, in the course of ages, may be regarded as *one man, who lives always and learns continually.*” The assumption of the mortality of our deeds is repulsive to our feelings, averse from our instincts, shocking to our reason, variant from nature, and reproachful towards God.

It is further alleged, as proof that the CHRISTIAN PRINCIPLE cannot be highly powerful, that the passions of men have been, and are, the most formidable agency in the world. It is doubtless true that men's passions are active, and that resentment at classes, at interests, at rivals, and at the defenders of obnoxious ideas; that jealousy of neighbors, envy of their prosperity, and hatred of their institutions, are as influential in moving States to legislation, as like passions are in moving men to action; while it is equally true that an honorable ambition, a supreme sense of right, a manly acknowledgment of what is due to others, and an unselfish and unstinting nobleness, are rare among nations and among men. But man is not all evil. Nor are all men alike evil. Some there are, whose elevation of sentiment, high-toned impulses and just ambition, place them before the nations as shining shafts, against which even envy, or jealousy, or malignity, can scarcely blow a breath—bright and beautiful monuments of the excellence of virtue. Such are not without their influence, as well in the far-reaching future as in the eventful present. Were this not so, what would life be worth? In fact, the influence of the good is proportionately greater than their numbers; for mankind have an instinctive reverence for good, and an instinctive shrinking from evil, and are, hence, prepared readily to welcome, encourage and honor the doers of the one, while they merely tolerate or mildly approve the doers of the other.

Passion, allied with power, has been, and is, a potent agent of evil. It has perpetrated, and is perpetrating monstrous enormities. It has confirmed the evil in their purposes, and given them rods wherewith to smite the victims. It has

shocked, and is shocking humanity by its outrages, and has covered whole continents with suffering, anguish and despair. Here, as elsewhere, it has connived, and is conniving, at injustice, is immolating the defenceless, and is striking terror to the hearts of thousands. But it is not omnipotent. It has found institutions too strong to be overturned, principles too stable to be moved, feelings too sincere to be conquered, men too bold to be intimidated, and too powerful to be defeated. Its whole marshalled host—the powers of darkness—can never triumph over the powers of light, and it is they who are arrayed in opposition. Thus, while we admit the power of passion over the affairs of mankind, as over the affairs of individuals, we deny that, as an influence in the world, it wholly displaces the good thoughts, good deeds, high aspirations, and unselfish sufferings of the noble of our race. For evil has not greater vitality than good.

But there is another qualifying thought to suggest. Men's passions are modified by various circumstances—by their training, by the moulding influences around them, by the spirit of their nation's institutions, by their social intercourse and by contact with civilizing and alleviating agencies. The roving Indian, the besotted Hottentot, or the semi-barbarous Chinese, are, in their passions, essentially different from even the uncultivated European or American. The Hindoo mother who willingly offers her babe an offering to her God, has not the same feelings as the civilized mother, whose religion demands no such horrid sacrifice. The murderous Sepoy who takes a fiendish pleasure in killing infants in the presence of their mother, roasting them and compelling her to partake; and who spares neither age, nor condition, nor sex in his unparalleled barbarities, is not to be classed as possessing the same feelings as the enraged American, who oversteps not the boundaries which international justice has affixed to the practices of war. The one has grown up under deeply barbarizing influences—the other under highly civilizing. They are the opposite poles of humanity. The one has had his tastes, instincts and feelings brutalized by the ignorance, superstition and vileness perpetually surrounding him. The other has had opened to his gaze a new and beautiful world, whose perfect loveliness has challenged his worship, has softened his asperities, has taught him new duties, and has cast his mind in a comelier mould. When we add to these influences, that of Christianity itself, we see that men's passions are further modified, even against their will, and without their

knowledge, and by what they practically avoid. Thus, if we grant the position that passion is a most powerful influence, we fall back upon the unquestionable truth, that passion itself is not free from the all-pervading, modifying influence of the CHRISTIAN PRINCIPLE ; and that, in computing the effects of the former, we necessarily include at least a partial recognition of the power of the latter. Thus, wheresoever we turn, we find it impossible to ignore the existence, in men's hearts, and minds, and deeds, of the CHRISTIAN PRINCIPLE.

I use the words CHRISTIAN PRINCIPLE—not the CHRISTIAN CHURCH—for the Church has not always been the perfect representative of the principle. Often its organization has been in the hands of the corrupt, the tyrannical and the base ; and its vast machinery, fearful punishments, and its peculiar, almost absolute power, been wielded more for the aggrandizement of Prelates than the good of the people. Its priests have, not rarely, been but little penetrated with the mild and benignant genius of Christianity ; and they have frequently been overbearing, arrogant, puffed up with the pride and pomp of power. Civil and Ecclesiastical tyranny early became parts of one system. They had a common basis—the hard hands, willing hearts, toiling bodies of the masses. Each sought to preserve the structure in which it comfortably nestled. Thus, even in English History, the Church was early the handmaid of Monarchy, the steady enemy of Liberty. In times of civil oppression, it taught as fundamental truths, the Divine Right of Kings, and the duty of passive obedience. Doctor Cowell taught that the king was above the law by his absolute power. Others denied that God ever prospered any rebellion against a natural and lawful prince. Sibthorp declared that the king might take the subject's money at his pleasure, and that no one might refuse his demand, on penalty of damnation. Mainwaring believed Parliaments established for the more equal and easy exacting from the people of the demands of the Crown ; or, as he expresses it, “for the more equal and easy exacting of that which unto kings doth appertain by natural and original law and justice, as their proper inheritance.” There were noble dissentients from these monstrous doctrines ; and one, George Abbot, Archbishop of Canterbury, who refused to license Sibthorp's sermon, was suspended therefor in his office, and banished from London. So generally did such sentiments prevail among this class, that in the times of James I, a member of Parliament called the clergy “spaniels to the court

and wolves to the people." In France, before the Revolution, the Church, long a political body, had become most odious. And justly so; for high authority declares that, notwithstanding the unquestioned excellence of many of the clergy, the Church, as an organization, "shielded vice in high places, while censuring it among the people;" and "threw its sacred mantle over existing institutions" which abounded with abuses, and opposed the writers of the day "when they stood forth on behalf of the general liberties of mankind." Hence it was among the first objects of attack, and fell before the frenzy of a maddened nation. Need I more than refer to Italy, and Spain, and Austria?—those Church-ridden countries, whose life-blood is the bloating beverage of religious hypocrites and civil despots. Surely not to them, or such as they, can the student of history look for the true exemplification of the CHRISTIAN PRINCIPLE.

But where is to be found the fitting portrayal of this principle? I reply, in the teachings of CHRIST—its author—wherein he blesses the "poor in spirit," and those "that mourn;" the meek, the merciful, the pure in heart, the peacemakers, the forgiving, the long-suffering and those slow to anger. And its best exemplification is to be found in those communities in which the injunction, "Love thy neighbor as thyself," and the rule, "Whatsoever ye would that others should do to you, do ye even so to them," are most fully recognized and most faithfully obeyed. The mere mention of these distinguishing characteristics suggests the thought that the CHRISTIAN PRINCIPLE is a foe to all injustice, oppression and wrong; and that it demands from government, securities against the commission of either. In this, it makes war upon the prejudices and policy of rulers, for Montesquieu's remark is too true, "that every man who has power, is brought to the abuse of it, and goes on until he finds its limits." The CHRISTIAN PRINCIPLE thus, from its very essence, at once became the foe of those who wielded power; and it early learned how bitter was their hatred. Its early home was among the poor, the suffering, the unofficial; for, we are told, it was the "common people" who heard Christ gladly. It appealed more to the affection of the humble, than to the pride of the powerful; and it found a friend in the one, and a foe in the other. And to-day, Christianity's throne is not in the exalted places of the earth; nor are her greatest triumphs recorded in legislative tome or pretentious parchment. They are rather written on the hearts of her children, and

are rarely read by the profane, the scoffing, or the unbelieving. But its demands have not been all unheeded; and in the improved respect for human rights, in the growing equality of privilege, in the increased dispensing of even-handed justice, in the protection of life, liberty and property, in the acknowledgment by legislators of the duties all owe to the cause of morality, and in the general growth of the liberal ideas which mark modern civilization, there is evidence that the CHRISTIAN PRINCIPLE has been unfolding its beauties, enlarging its circle of influence, and extending its power over the affairs of men—not, indeed, by bolts, and bars, and bayonets, not by violence, disorder and outrage, not by those outward weapons which have been invoked for the defence and propagation of other systems; but by the gentle influence of its precepts, the persuasive voice of enlightened conscience, and the noiseless tread of its all-conquering ideas.

I have alluded to modern civilization, as contrasted with ancient. The distinguishing marks of each have been pointed out by the great publicist, Dr. Lieber, and are worthy of consideration in this connexion. Ancient governments had not, comparatively, prolonged existence, or great recuperative power. But one flourished at a time. They failed to unite the enjoyment of wealth with the enjoyment of liberty—each having grown actually weaker as it grew pecuniarily stronger. They did not attain nationalization of structure. They did not protect individual liberty. They never advanced to the establishment of international codes. Yet all these are *essentials* of good government. For without long life, how can nations attain their full growth? Without great recuperative power, how can they overcome inevitable reverses? Without the checks arising from rivalry of interests, how can overshadowing despotism be averted? With prosperity, how can they fail to become rich, and if riches destroy them, how can permanency be obtained? Without the local organization necessary to form a NATION, how can government protect the people from abuses, from oppression, from degradation? Without protection to individual liberty, how can individual safety be secured? And without international law, how can national intercourse be regulated, and national difficulties be peacefully settled? From all these running sores, ancient governments suffered. Not so with modern. For they have greater tenacity of life, and greater recuperative power.—Many flourish at the same period. They have assimilated the possession of national and individual wealth with the contin-

ued enjoyment of civil liberty; have produced thoroughly-developed, compactly-organized, highly-vitalized NATIONS, with all their extensive appliances; have protected each man as well as whole classes, from the inroads of power; and have established certain great principles for the respect of all, to guide the conduct and regulate the intercourse of each. For such amazing differences, what causes can be sufficient? Will the possession of increased knowledge alone solve the problem? No; for more than knowledge is required, to effect that moderation of human feelings, that temperance in action, that devotion to right, which alone will wholly revolutionize ourselves, others and the world. Will the prevalence and play everywhere of human passions, explain this wondrous growth? No; for this work of construction required rare calmness, utmost patience, unfaltering fidelity, steady courage, high faith—not the excitedness, the restlessness, the impulsiveness, the fitfulness of passion. What, so much as the special, peculiar, all-pervading influence of that religion whose expansive principles are adapted to every phase of society, to every emergency of government, to every relation and duty of mankind, and, when applied, will solve every difficulty, and extricate from every dilemma?—aided, preserved, and strengthened by a net-work of INSTITUTIONS, strong, compact, and well-knit, capable of resisting the gnawings of jealousy, the restiveness of pride, and the violence of anger.—INSTITUTIONS alike operative upon all, and pervaded by an enlarged and comprehensive humanity.

Passion and violence are the preludes of folly. Who acts wisely, that yields himself to the dictates of burning anger? Who achieves good for himself or others, without the exercise of healthy self-control? Who does not harm his moral nature, by departing from that equability which, in being a conquest of man over himself, is his greatest triumph? Likewise is it with nations. Their hasty, ill-considered, passion-prompted acts, always bear a bountiful crop of evil. And to learn when a nation has done itself, its cause, the great principles of right an inexcusable injury, it is only necessary to inquire when its judgments have been perverted by the heated and hurtful suggestions of passion. Men do not, in general, calmly, determinedly, and from choice, do evil. It is when reason is dethroned and anger enthroned, that words are said, deeds are done, provocations given, which cost long years of repentant sorrow. Thus every fatal error which history points out, every crime which has been expiated by a dissolution,

every heaven-defying deed which has cried aloud for vengeance, can be traced to this one grand cause—the disregard of the CHRISTIAN PRINCIPLE. If, then, this neglect be a fertile source of individual and national suffering—if so much of evil has flowed from it, and is likely to flow from it—it becomes a great question, how is this torrent to be stayed? Not by the agency of the intellectual faculties, for the testimony of the past, and the daily experience of every man, prove that “intellectual education, though it develops and strengthens the faculties of the mind, is yet INCAPABLE of controlling the passions.” On the contrary, the intellect often feeds them. Great intellect has been the seat of violent passions, and the greater the intellect, often the more violent the passions. There is but one competent power—the CHRISTIAN PRINCIPLE. It is the antipode of passion, and is of superior strength. While the tendency of the one is debasing, the other is refining. The one develops the evil of man’s nature, the other draws forth the good. The one drives man downward, the other impels him upward, giving him a new ambition, and opening a new path for his powers. They are natural foes. The field of both being man’s moral nature, and the genius of the two being directly antagonistic, one must be extirpated. They cannot divide allegiance over man’s heart. Hence, when passion reigned, and when despotism—its child—covered the earth, all was dark, gloomy and repulsive; and, as debauchery, licentiousness, perversion of principle, and every form of wickedness spread, with wonderful rapidity, from the Court to the Church, and from the Church to the people; as the wicked rioted in evil, the weak were trampled on, the innocent were punished with stripes, and the unjust fattened on spoils, the virtuous wept at the accumulating evidences of the reality of the fearful apprehension that earth was, indeed, forsaken of its God. But the fear was groundless. At last error reached its culminating point. The CHRISTIAN PRINCIPLE sprang, full-armed, from the heart of Jehovah, commissioned to wage a ceaseless war with man’s greatest enemy. It did so; still does so; and will do so, while there is a form of error to be exterminated, an evil sentiment to be uprooted, an evil deed to be prevented, or an evil heart to be changed. The contest will not end until every son of earth, and every human instrumentality, is wrested from a polluting service and is purified; until every living soul is purged with hyssop and made clean, and stands erect, A MAN, all aglow with his perfected powers—redeemed,

regenerated and disenthralled, not only in that lower sense of which CURRAN has rapturously spoken, but in that higher and holier sense which a greater than Curran has beautifully and mercifully taught—in whose realization every creature, freed from a more fearful than human oppression—the tyranny of evil—shall be illuminated with the light of the Spirit, and be made a fit residence for the God of all grace.

It is unnecessary, and would be impossible, to trace in detail, the influence of the CHRISTIAN PRINCIPLE upon every part of man's nature, or upon every institution of his government. This is the work of the historian, not the brief essayist. The briefest mention of the most prominent of its results, is all which falls within our scope. It has driven from existence that hero-worship which led the ancients to deify men, while it keeps fresh, and makes more active, the sentiment of admiration for the truly heroic. It has rescued man from those excessive passions which swallowed up every principle, making of highest merit what we call a crime. It has diverted the sentiment of veneration from mythologic gods, but little better and sometimes much worse than men, and has increased the enthusiasm, energy and power of the feeling, by giving as its object, the author and embodiment of all good, whose holiness, and justice, and goodness, and truth are without limit, or blemish, or defect. It has modified the avarice of men, and proved its indulgence incompatible with prime duties. It has dissipated the dimness and darkness which perplexed, and finally overthrew the ancients—and it bids the modern walk along those deep declivities, over those rocky paths and those treacherous pitfalls—calm, confident and safe. It has taken up Truth where baffled philosophers were forced to abandon its pursuit, has analyzed, described, and displayed its long-sought beauties, and showed its connexion with its author, the great ETERNAL. It is the parent of true charity, which, before, the world knew not—that charity which “suffereth long and is kind,” which “envieth not,” which “vaunteth not itself, and is not puffed up,” which “is not easily provoked,” which “thinketh no evil.” It has peopled with exalted creations the moral world, which Paganism left “a wilderness with fiery serpents in it,” and has given its large-heartedness to modern civilization, whose noble benefactions and munificent charities are “the outward and worldly expression of the spiritual truths of Christianity.” It has given art the splendid inspiration, the ravishing ten-

derness which is its crowning beauty, and which, before, was seen "as through a glass darkly." It has given triumphs to the pencil of an Angelo, and the chisel of a Crawford. It has added charms to the graceful form of Jutsice. It has enriched Law, by gifts from its vast possessions. It has given Science a grander aim, a surer direction, a holier mission.—It has modified the rigors of war, stimulated the arts of peace, and introduced new and vital elements into society, making their rightfulness the absolute and decisive test of all enactments. It has overturned groveling superstitions, exploded odious distinctions, and inaugurated truer ideas. It is that conservative, yet that destructive spirit which holds fast the good, and pulls down the evil in the world; which is most intolerant of wrong, and most protective of right; which has ever warred against the evil practices of men, and which, while building that splendid and spacious mansion in which all the nations will ultimately live in harmony and peace, is, in our day, most occupied in destroying the ingenious mechanism—those dark passages, those covert retreats, those gloomy dungeons, by which the few have wickedly oppressed the many. Through man—whom bruised and broken, it wrested from the destroyer, and has re-created—whose virtuous impulses it has sustained, whose tastes it has refined, whose conceptions beautified, whose ideal exalted, whose sympathies expanded, whose meekness, patience and courage it has strengthened, and over all whose faculties it has shed its purifying spirit—through this exalted re-creation of its power, the CHRISTIAN PRINCIPLE reaches his daily life, his associates, his home, society, and the whole frame-work of government, ennobling all by breathing upon all the balmy sweetness of its nature.

What influence so penetrative? What so pervasive? What so expanded in its reach, so complete in its character, so intense in its action, so marked in its results? Permeating every part of man, and every object within human touch, omitting nothing, baffled by nothing, but bringing all in admirable subjection to itself, it is, as a great balance-wheel, regulating the world; checking its evil tendencies, encouraging its good, and so moulding all as to give greatest glory to the Divine Author of us all. It is a heaven-sent influence, which no human invention can stay, no obstacles obstruct, and no combination of power crush; which reaches beyond this earth, and will be co-extensive with eternity. Upon earth, it is the controlling influence. And when the globe has been melted

with fervent heat, and the heavens rolled up as a scroll, it will wing its way to the home, whence for man's good it came, and ever growing in power, will through unending ages, rejoicingly intensify the praises which the redeemed will sing to their Great Deliverer.

ARTICLE VIII.

BACCALAUREATE ADDRESS.

No. IV.

The following address was delivered to the graduating class in September 1838, consisting of Messrs. Crapster, Keiser, Keller, Naill, Stoever and Waters. It was based on the subjects assigned the class for their addresses. The order of exercises was as follows: Latin Salutation—M. L. Stoever; Oration on Eloquence—J. R. Keiser; Oration on Duelling—James Crapster; Oration on the Bible—F. A. M. Keller; Oration on the Influence of American Institutions on the world—Cyrus Waters; Valedictory Address—J. E. Naill. The subjects discussed by the class will explain the *Baccalaureate*.

YOUNG GENTLEMEN:—Whatever of good feeling and kind wishes you may cherish towards us, we receive with gratitude, and reciprocate with sincerity. For you, we desire a life no less marked by the favors of Providence and all real enjoyment, than you have desired for us. We feel disposed to rival you fully in all pure desires of blessedness and peace, and earnest prayers for your temporal and spiritual well-being. In that world, with which you are henceforth more particularly to mingle, and in which you are to take a part, on which your power is to be felt either for good or evil, you will find use for all that you have acquired in the halls of science, and a most ample field for the illustration and application of the principles which have been advocated by you on this memorable occasion.

If eloquence has received no undue encomiums, if the facts attesting its power are authenticated beyond all reasonable doubt, if it can, wielded by the initiated, work moral miracles, if it can throw a powerful illumination on man's intellectual energies, if it can fire the soul with the purest and noblest passions, if it can rouse to action, worthy the dignity

of man, commensurate with all his obligations, and most conducive to the reign of bliss, then it deserves your truest homage. You should aim to possess and to employ it. The path has been opened before you. You have dwelt in the region of poetry and eloquence, you have sat at the feet of the mighty magicians of ancient and modern times, you have heard the strains of Demosthenes and Cicero, of Chatham and Burke, you have learned the art of oratory from Aristotle and Quintilian, from Blair and Kames, and now, prosecuting the path laid open before you, pursuing the liberal studies with which your minds have been imbued—tasking yourselves like the great Grecian orator, to cultivate every energy, and to overcome every defect, you may win for yourselves the high commendation, deserving the aspirations of every pure intelligence, of eloquent propagators and defenders of truth, magnanimous pleaders for the best interests of humanity.— You live in a land which, above all others, presents the highest inducements to cultivate the power of persuasion. It is the favorite abode of that liberty which Longinus declares to be the home, the favorite dwelling-place of the Oratoric Muse. It is by the spirit of eloquence that you will attune your breasts to that moral harmony which will eject from them every vile passion, inordinate anger, malice, revenge. It is by this that you can paint the outrage committed against God and man, in every act designed to abbreviate human existence. If you cultivate eloquence on the most extensive principles, you will never permit yourselves to thirst for the blood of your fellow-men, and you will expel, by all the force of your accumulated suasion, those savage passions and perverted sentiments, which drive to the battle-field the rational creatures of God, to shoot each other down, in violation of all law, human and divine. We would have you to prepare yourselves to take a part—and an active one, too—in destroying this fiend—duelling—which has destroyed its thousands, and under whose fearful lashes so many hearts, most finely strung, bleed, agonize and writhe. It must cease. It cannot hold its footing in a Christian, in a free country. Its downfall may depend, in part, on our efforts, and our ambition should be, to be present at its overthrow, to unite in the shout of its entire extirpation.

Such a course, and such a one alone, is becoming us, who have studied the pages of that inspired volume, the Bible, the day-star from on high, to guide us in our pathway to bliss and Paradise. Unworthy would we be of the name of civilization,

much more unworthy the name of friends of the Bible, if we could advocate those murderous passions, or that murder which it so pointedly condemns, and which it threatens so fearfully to punish. Little does it become us to advocate the right of man to destroy the life of his fellow-man, when our great ethical code, purer than ever Tully, or Epictetus taught, declares unto us: "Thou shalt not kill," and presents to us the great exemplar of the purest ethics uttering the words: "That whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause, shall be in danger of the judgment, and whosoever shall say to his brother Raca, shall be in danger of the council: but whosoever shall say, thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire."

It is the Bible, which has received so much deserved praise, to which we can resort, to which we ought, to learn from prophets and apostles, yea, from the Son of God himself the science of salvation and the mysteries of eternity. It is the careful perusal of this, in the spirit it inculcates, that will make us wise unto salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus, and we may study it too, to learn eloquence. For there it is of the very highest order. Some of the most distinguished orators in Great Britain and this country, have confessed themselves greatly indebted for whatever of eloquence they had, to the study of the Scriptures, and deeply am I convinced, that if you pursue the course recommended by the advocate of the Bible on this occasion, you will realize all we desire for you; our good wishes will not be in vain; your hearts will burn with the fire of true eloquence, your lips will utter mighty words, your life will subvert impurity and ungodliness, and your names may be heralded forth as the champions of everything holy and good. You will abide in the holy mount of the Lord, where dwells no unhallowed strife, where widows and orphans mourn not their murdered partners and sires, where there is no war, either great or small, but the wolf dwells with the lamb, and the leopard with the kid, and the calf and the young lion and the fatling dwell together, and where they will neither hurt nor destroy, for the sword is beaten into the ploughshare, and the spear into the pruning hook.

It is by making these things your aim, by cultivating eloquence, by repressing vindictive passions, by surrendering your hearts to the revealed will of God, as contained in the Holy Bible, that you will place yourselves in the proper position for the sons of free America.

Great things are expected of us as a nation ; and mighty, as we have learned, is the influence which we have exerted, and are destined to exert in the earth. Much can be done by us, as a people, for the glory of the Redeemer, and the civil and religious rights of the world. Ours is a high responsibility ! If our part is well performed, great will be our honor; but if not, our elevation in influence will only serve the more deeply to degrade us, and make us the hissing and scorn of the earth. Every American must then be faithful to his country, to its institutions, its laws. He should be intelligent, virtuous, good : the enemy of oppression, the friend of free discussion. He should be eloquent if he can, the opponent of brute force of every kind, and the devout admirer and student of the Bible. These things have had your advocacy, Young Gentlemen, and we say to you, in the language of the Great Teacher sent from heaven, in the inimitably beautiful parable of the good Samaritan—*Go ye and do likewise.*

Uniting with these that individual effort, the creations of which have just been portrayed ; prosecuting whatever is praiseworthy and good, with an inflexible resolution, you can hardly fail to gain the prize; you will, and this we regard as more important than success, have done your duty ; so far as merit is ascribable to man, it will be to you, and the highest satisfaction and the most immovable tranquility will dwell in your bosoms, because they will declare that you have done your duty.

Labor then, not for perishable, but imperishable good, for the meat that endureth to eternal life, and in the midst of your toils your strength will be renewed, you will mount with wings as eagles, you will run without becoming weary, you will walk without growing faint.

Your valedictory, too, has fallen on our ears. You have said to us, *We go*, we leave you and turn to other places and to other pursuits ; you submit to the directions of providence, and sever with reluctance and pain, most interesting ties.—Your thoughts will revert to these scenes of your youth, to these Academic shades, to these endeared companions and friends, to these respected fathers and guides ; whilst life lasts, your affections will flow towards this consecrated spot, and your devotions will be attended with prayers for blessings on us. Thus have we understood you. These are your parting words. Go then, summoned by your Maker, go to do the work assigned you ! Go, assured that we shall hold you in

affectionate remembrance, and desire that you may prosper in body and spirit, in external blessings and honors, in time and eternity!

Endeavor, young gentlemen, to perform your part well, to honor your education and the School at which it was obtained. We sincerely pray that you may be good men and true. Let everything vicious be put far away from you. Cultivate moral purity, Christian holiness, and aim to be imitators of God as children. Seek to be useful in the world, to influence for good, the race of man. Strive to increase the amount of happiness in the world, and aim to render your memory blessed when your career shall be terminated, and your abode be in that eternity to which we all tend. Let this thought abide with you, that you are progressing towards eternity, that you will soon occupy it; that eternity which is the theatre for those great developments of happiness or misery, which the justice of the moral governor of the universe will assign to every one, according to the tenor of his actions, during the period of his probation in this world. It is this, my young friends, that invests our future course with so fearful an interest; it is this that awakens so deep a solicitude for you; we know that on your future course depends eternal happiness or misery, and unworthy would we be to be instructors of youth, and to minister at God's holy altar, if we did not earnestly desire, and sincerely pray that, carrying with you the solemn truths to which we have directed your attention, the doctrines of inspiration we have taught you, you might be found on the side of God, fighting against sin, prepared constantly by hearts glowing with love to the Savior of your souls, to lie down calmly on the couch of death, rejoicing in the hope of eternal life, should death visit you in the morning of your days, or to perform an important part in carrying forward the kingdom of the Messiah to the utmost limits of the habitable globe. We return then your Farewell. Peace be with you! God grant you every blessing, grant that you may have a good report of all men, and of the truth itself, and after a life protracted and useful, may those who surround your dying pillow, see how good men triumph in the hour of death!

ARTICLE IX.

ELOQUENCE.

ELOQUENCE may be defined to be the power of influencing, directing and controlling the actions of men, through the medium of reason and the passions. It is very manifest, that the passions cannot be reached before the understanding is convinced. No one could attempt to address the passions, before the way had been prepared by the removal of prejudice, prepossession and ignorance, and the subjects were placed upon the clear foundation of reason. Reason is necessary to inform the understanding and the conscience, and to place the auditor in a position in which there is nothing in the way of action, except inclination. But reason is not sufficient to make him act. Duty may be clear, the subject may be fully brought before the mind, whilst indolence and motives drawn from the various forms of selfishness, may exert a more powerful influence. Here, then, seems to be the province of true eloquence; to influence the feelings in such a way as to bring them over to the side of reason and conscience, so that the whole man will be completely under the power of truth. In this situation nothing can intimidate, nothing can conquer, for the soul is all on fire, the moving spring to action has been touched, and all its dependencies will move in harmony with it. Here the power of the orator is the greatest conceivable. Reason and passion govern man, and the orator has both under his control. He directs, stimulates and restrains, according to his pleasure. He holds at his bidding, and subject to his will, immortal mind, which cannot be arrested by floods, or mountains, or by the chains and dungeons of tyrants. It is creditable alike to human nature, and to the power of eloquence, that in all ages and in every country where she has been unfettered, she has controlled and governed the minds of men.

If we wish to form a correct and adequate estimate of eloquence, we must ascertain what she has already accomplished, and what, from her nature, she is able to accomplish.

If we direct our attention to the latter particular, to which we have already adverted, we are led to the conclusion, that this is the moving power in every free government. Mind can be effectually operated upon only by mind. The mind

acquainted with its own operations, knowing how it is influenced and moved, is prepared to move and influence others. For however the minds of men may differ in constitutional temperament and capabilities, they all agree in this, that they can be influenced, and influenced only by motives addressed to them. The causes which lead to action in one individual, are similar to those which stimulate another; hence multitudes are moved at once, as if by some unseen and supernatural power. If we look at the history of the past, we will be enabled to see more clearly the importance of the subject. And here we are confined to those particular governments in which there was perfect freedom of discussion on all subjects. We will look in vain for specimens of high oratory, where the speaker is trammelled by the restraints of authority, or terrified by the fear of physical force. Neither can we expect to meet with them where large masses of mind are not to be influenced. The people may be free. They may be governed by the most salutary laws, and yet eloquence have no room to display itself. The proper field for eloquence is that in which the supreme power rests with the people. Where laws are enacted and repealed, war declared, peace concluded, and, in a word, all the affairs of the government are managed, either directly or indirectly, not by the arbitrary will of a single individual, but by the voice of the people. In addition to this, only certain important occasions will call forth the powers of the orator; circumstances which form epochs in the history of a country.

We do not, however, look to the absolute monarchies of antiquity for illustrations of eloquence. They furnish nothing but specimens of cruelty and oppression, on the one hand, and fulsome flattery and abject submission on the other. We pass by Egypt, Assyria, and the empires of the East generally, and directing our steps Westward, find among the Greeks the circumstances in which we would naturally look for true oratory. Their most ancient form of government was not unlike that of our Aborigines and the ancient Germans. There were indeed chiefs called kings, and others occupying a lower place; but these offices were in the gift of the whole tribe, and their voice was supreme. Indeed, so much did the democratic principle prevail among them in the time of Homer, that he transferred it to some extent to the government of the universe by the gods. There was eloquence in Greece long before the time of Demosthenes. Nestor and Ulysses,

in the time of the Trojan war, are represented to have excelled in the art. Pythagoras, by this, led the voluptuous and effeminate inhabitants of Magna Greeca to the cultivation of virtue and morality, Pisistratus became supreme at Athens, Solon procured the enactment of wholesome laws, and Pericles adorned the city, and made it the pride and mistress of Greece. Although no one, perhaps, ever excelled Pericles in forcible speaking, yet as more is known of Demosthenes, we will consider the history of his life in detail, as an illustration of the power of eloquence, and as furnishing motives to the more assiduous cultivation of this art.

Demosthenes was descended from one of the principal citizens of Athens, of the same name. His father died when he was seven years old, and left him a patrimony worth fifteen thousand dollars. This patrimony, falling into the hands of dishonest guardians, was partly appropriated to their own use, and partly neglected; so that but little came into his hands at his majority. In addition to this, his tutors' salaries were not paid, and thus he was deprived of the advantages of that education to which his position in society entitled him. Moreover, his frame was delicate and sickly, so that his friends did not require him to exert himself, and his preceptors being ill-paid, did not press him to attend to them. His early education, therefore, was very deficient. His natural defects were also of a very serious character. He also stuttered, and was very short of breath, so that the boys are said to have given him the contemptuous name of *Batalus*, who was an effeminate musician ridiculed by Aristophanes in one of his farces. His disposition was by no means amiable. Indeed, so morose and savage was he, that he received the epithet *Argas*, the name of a certain species of serpent. With such a disposition of mind and bodily frame, he went to hear the celebrated orator, Callistratus, plead in behalf of the city of Oropus. The success and ability of Callistratus, were very much admired. He was conducted home with marked distinction, and complimented by the people; Demosthenes observed it all, and marked with astonishment the power of that eloquence, which could, with resistless energy, carry all before it. His soul was fired with emulation. He longed to possess the same power. And now he becomes, in a certain sense, a new being. He throws aside all those studies to which boys usually attend, and devotes himself to the work of declamation. Some tell us that he was a student of Plato, and was much assisted by him, in his preparation for public speaking. How-

ever this may be, it is certain that he studied oratory under Isaeus, a keen and subtle speaker. The school of Isocrates was most frequented by aspirants after public honor, but Demosthenes found in Isaeus a taste and genius more like his own, distinguished not by the smooth and florid, but by force and energy. At the age of eighteen, which, it would seem, was the age of manhood at Athens, he prosecuted his guardians for breach of trust, and, after much delay and much difficulty, he succeeded in recovering a small part of his property.

The success which attended the first effort of our orator, inspired him with confidence to address the assemblies of the people. But here he was doomed to suffer mortification and defeat, sufficient to drive a less determined spirit completely from the field. In his first address to the people, he was laughed at and interrupted by their clamors. Indeed it was no easy matter to address an Athenian audience. Conceive of a people fickle and fond of novelty to a proverb. Accustomed to the highest degree of refinement of speech and manners. Daily hearing the most distinguished actors of tragedy and comedy, with the license of judges either to approve or condemn, and carrying into their public national deliberations, the same spirit of criticism. Conceive of a multitude prepared to burst forth in the most intemperate laughter and approbation, at what they approved, and on the other hand, with groans and hisses, expressing their disapprobation at what they condemned. When you fancy such an auditory, you may form some faint conception of the embarrassment attending the maiden speech of a bashful young man. In addition to this, the decorum and proprieties of an Athenian auditory were not characterized by the staid and sober gravity which attend our public assemblies. Theirs were the tumultuous movements of a people, who knew no law but their own pleasure, and who were agitated and tossed like the waves of the sea. Not unfrequently, when the people had been captivated by the sentiments and manner of one orator, they clamored aloud, and sought to drown the voice of any other speaker who might address them. Now figure to yourselves Demosthenes, when he first appeared in the assembly as a speaker, and you may judge of the manner in which he would be received by such an audience. Conceive a man of an austere and discontented air, scratching his head, shrugging his shoulders, with a shrill and feeble voice, a difficult respiration, tones that grated on the ear, a barbarous

pronunciation, and a style still more barbarous, composed of endless, inexhaustible, unintelligible periods, and this connected with a manner in the highest degree violent, and you will not wonder that he was hissed and hooted, and laughed at, by the assembly, and for a time was obliged to retire. Here then were the natural and artificial obstacles thrown in the way of his success as an orator. But his was the spirit to be discouraged by no difficulties, and to be unwearied in the midst of multiplied labors. Real genius may, for a time, remain in obscurity, its fire may be covered by the mass of rubbish resting upon it, but it will ultimately blaze forth, to warm and to dazzle.

We come now to consider the course which he pursued to perfect himself in his profession, a course which, if it may not now be imitated in its details, furnishes to all who desire to come before the public as speakers, an untiring zeal and laboriousness, worthy of admiration and imitation. His style was formed upon that of Thucidydes, sententious, vigorous, comprehensive; a style unquestionably best suited to that forcible eloquence by which masses of men are moved and forced into action. In order to acquire this style, which so well suited his natural genius, we are informed that he copied the history of Thucidydes eight times. Now this was, in fact, not only acquiring a particular form of words and construction of sentences, it was acquiring a particular mode of thinking. It was a moulding of the forms and images of his own mind after the model of the great historian. The labor of such an undertaking was very great, but the fruit of that labor appeared subsequently in the glory of the achievements which he was enabled to perform. But his style was not his principal defect. A good style, clear and forcible, is unquestionably a high quality in a public speaker, and necessary to success, yet if it is not accompanied by a manner, a delivery in every respect correspondent, a high degree of eloquence will not be attained. On a certain occasion, when he had been ill received in the assembly, and was returning home with his head covered and in great distress, Satyrus the player followed and went in with him. Demosthenes lamented that though he was the most laborious of all the orators, and had almost sacrificed his health to that application, yet he could gain no favor with the people: But drunken seamen and other unlettered persons were heard, and kept the rostrum, whilst he was entirely disregarded. "You say true," answered Satyrus, "but I will soon provide a remedy

if you will repeat to me some speech in Euripides or Sophocles." When Demosthenes had concluded, Satyrus pronounced the same speech, and did it with such propriety of action and intonation, such emphasis and cadence, that to the orator it appeared quite a different passage. He now understood so well how much grace and dignity action adds to the best oration, that he thought it a small matter to premeditate and compose, though with the utmost care, if the pronunciation and propriety of gesture were not observed. Here we have the secret of that remarkable reply to the question, what is the first thing in eloquence, and the second, and the third? *Action, Action, Action!* By action the orator did not mean simply gesture, but the whole delivery, including tones, expression of countenance, posture, gesture, pause, emphasis and cadence.

Animated by this exhibition of what could be accomplished, and feeling within him the kindling emotions of true eloquence, he resolved to attain like excellence. He built a subterraneous study, and repaired thither every day, to form his action and exercise his voice. Here he would frequently remain, as Plutarch informs us, during two and three months together, shaving one side of his head, so that he would be ashamed to go abroad into company. But important as he regarded delivery, he did not neglect an industrious improvement of all the means of mental culture within his reach. He had before his mind a single object, and to the attainment of that end he directed all his energies, and made all the occurrences of life subservient. To this single cause is to be ascribed his wonderful proficiency and success as an orator.

Demosthenes was preparing himself to exert upon his fellow citizens the most powerful influence possible, by means of speech. When he went out, therefore, to make a visit, or when he received one, he would take something that passed in conversation, some business or fact reported to him, for a subject upon which to exercise himself. As soon as he parted from his friends, he retired to his study and repeated the matter as it passed, and the arguments for and against it.—The substance of the speeches which he heard, he committed to memory, and afterwards reduced them to regular sentences and periods, meditating a variety of corrections and improvements, both for what others had said to him and he had addressed to them. It is said that Cicero pursued the same course in the formation of his own oratorical character.

The result of such industry and unwearied application is not left to conjecture. He acquired an influence in the community which swayed, for a time, the destinies of Greece. By the simple power of his eloquence he alarmed, restrained and conquered the hero of Macedon, and for a long time sustained the sinking fortune and drooping energies of his native city. But heathen virtue, sustained by heathen ambition, could not resist the downward tendency of depraved human nature, led on by luxury and gold. Athens shorn of her glory, effeminate, venal and servile, after a few ineffectual struggles against the giant power, whose iron strength could not be resisted, sank with her eloquence and her arts, never to arise until the sovereign energy of a new and spiritual life shall raise her to the dignity of a Christian people.

What was it, then, in Demosthenes, that elevated him in the power of speaking, to an unrivalled excellency? Was it natural endowments? No! We see that in all these, he was inferior to most of his age. A heavy voice, difficulty of utterance, confusion of ideas, and a feeble body. No one would have predicted his future success from his previous character and attainments. To what then is he indebted for his superiority? Unquestionably first to his industry and application. There was but a single object in view, and that was continually before his mind.

Secondly, the circumstances of the times were calculated to call forth all the fire and energy of his soul. He had a glorious subject for his political ambition. He cherished all the high notions of Grecian, and especially Athenian superiority, which were so common among his countrymen. He was born and reared in the midst of the most democratic people that ever lived. All that he heard and saw, all institutions, social, civil and religious, breathed the spirit of liberty. He himself inherited from his father a free and noble spirit. Hence he would naturally regard with suspicion, all foreign powers. He looked upon the barbarians with contempt. To him then, nothing would be more dreadful than slavery. But personal servitude would be trifling, compared with the slavery of his native country, and of all Greece. He was fired with the spirit of the heroes who died at Thermopylae, and of those who embarked in their vessels, willing to forsake country and home, rather than be the servants of a foreign power. Now his ambition, as well as indignation, was enkindled at the encroachments of Philip, and the glory of being the champion and defender of Greece. Never had a man a

more glorious subject to arouse and stimulate, unless it be the glory of the Redeemer's spiritual kingdom. He no doubt felt that his country was in imminent danger, and had some presentiment of the fate which awaited her. To delay such a dreadful consummation of things, he threw himself into the breach, and with a zeal and devotion worthy the highest praise, exerted his mighty powers.

Thirdly, the fact that he was surrounded by distinguished orators, contributed not a little to the development of his genius. We have seen that his attention was directed to the subject of eloquence, by hearing a distinguished orator harangue the multitude, and perceiving the influence which he exerted upon them by means of speech. An impulse, no less powerful, was constantly at work, derived from the great men by whom he was surrounded.

Fourthly, if the question be asked, had moral qualities any influence in raising him to the eminence which he attained? We answer unquestionably, Yes! His temper and his social qualities were, indeed, by no means of a prepossessing character. On the contrary, he was peevish, fretful and morose. But his integrity, his patriotism, his affection for Greece and hatred of tyrants, were never questioned. The interests of Athens and of Greece, were invariably pursued by him.—When he proposed a measure, and rose to support it, the multitude were persuaded that whilst he was liable to err in judgment, he would advocate only that which his judgment approved. In his harangue he invariably appealed to the higher and nobler feelings of our nature. He recalls to mind the ancestral virtue and glory of the Athenians, points them to the worthies who maintained the supremacy of Greece, and threw their protecting arm around the less States. He points out their disinterestedness, laboriousness, constancy, fidelity, and their consequent success, and then calls upon his degenerate countrymen to imitate their example. Now, unless he had been influenced by the spirit which he was laboring to awaken in others, he never thus could have appealed to the dead, who had offered up their lives at Marathon and Platea. The influence of Phocion, who is said to have been a more forcible speaker than Demosthenes, arose mainly from his moral character. He was poor, and without a stain to sully the purity of his character. Thus Demosthenes triumphed until the love of gold betrayed him into a sacrifice of principle. From that time forward the people would not

hear him speak, even in his own defence, until he atoned for his crime by banishment.

Without dwelling any longer upon the particulars of the character of this distinguished personage, it is proper to assert that Greece is not the only field in which high eloquence may flourish, nor did the divine art expire with Demosthenes. We have presented to us, in this country, as wide a field as the ambition of man can desire. We have not, indeed, the popular assemblies of Athens, but we have larger assemblies, where interests, equally important are discussed and decided. Let him, then, who is ambitious to do good, and to become master of the most powerful instrument put into the hands of man for this purpose, become eloquent. Let him lay hold of truth as the agent, and by means of speech wield it with all his might for the glory of God and the good of man. But let it be eloquence of the right kind. The eloquence of thought and of feeling. "Eloquence," says an admired writer, "must flow like a stream that is fed by an abundant spring, and not spout forth a little frothy stream on some gaudy day, and then remain dry for the rest of the year. Such was the eloquence of all those illustrious ancients whom history has celebrated; and such, in every free State, must be the eloquence which can really bring advantage to the public, or honor to the possessor. The voice may be tuned to the most musical perfections. The action may be modelled to the utmost grace and propriety. Expressions may be chosen of energy, delicacy and majesty. The period may be taught to flow with all the ease and eloquence of harmonious modulation. Yet these are but inferior parts of genuine eloquence. The weapon of the orator should be bright and glittering indeed; but this should arise from the keenness of its edge. It should be managed with grace, but with such grace as is an indication of consummate skill and strength." We are told of a Grecian general, who when he travelled and viewed the country around him, revolved in his mind how an army might be there drawn up to the greatest advantage; how he could best defend himself, if attacked from such a quarter; how advance with the greatest security, and how retreat with the least danger. Something similar to this should be the practice and study of a public speaker. Thus, for the most part, was Demosthenes employed in his days of retirement and severe application.

Especially does it become those who have consecrated themselves to the work of the ministry, to make as high attain-

ments as possible in this all-conquering art. Whilst eloquence is the principal, and in one aspect of the subject, the only mode of influencing the heart and life in the assembly, at the bar, and in the pulpit, there is comparatively little or no direct attention bestowed upon the subject. It is true, all the knowledge that can be acquired, may be employed by the public speaker, and our systems of education are calculated to furnish many facts and truths, and much mental discipline, yet there are but few young men who pursue these studies with the single aim of qualifying themselves for high and commanding eloquence. The subject is not even contemplated with seriousness. Its nature, design and power are not examined, and consequently the means of acquiring and wielding it with skill, are comparatively neglected. When the importance of this subject is fully understood, and the mind directed to it as the greatest engine in the hands of man to benefit his fellow-beings and glorify his Maker, then may we expect to witness displays of power in no respects inferior to those by which Demosthenes united the republics of Greece, arrayed them against Philip, arrested his march at Thermopylae, and defeated his measures directed against Byzantium and the neighboring cities.

ARTICLE X.

NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

Lectures on the British Poets. By Henry Reed, LL. D. Late Professor of English Literature in the University of Pennsylvania. In two volumes. Philadelphia: Parry and McMillan.—1857.

We have already noticed, with decided approbation, in the pages of the Review, Professor Reed's "English Literature" and "English History," which have been so favorable received on both sides of the Atlantic. We now take great pleasure in commanding to the attention of our readers his "Lectures on the British Poets." They are the result of extensive reading and mature reflection, containing much valuable information and full of thought, worthy of the profound scholar and the distinguished reputation enjoyed, during his life-time, by the author. As a

model of a chaste, pure style, they deserve to occupy a very high place. Young men in our Literary Institutions cannot fail to be greatly benefited by the perusal and study of these excellent Lectures. No one can come in contact with them without becoming wiser and better. We regard them as most important contributions to the literature of our country, and are grateful to the Editor for so kindly giving them to the public. We trust that these volumes will be succeeded by others, containing the other posthumous papers of the lamented author, and by the "Memoir" which has been promised, and is awaited with much interest.

The Analogy of Religion to the Constitution and Course of Nature: To which are added two brief dissertations—on personal identity and on the nature of virtue. By Joseph Butler, D. C. L. With an introduction, notes, conspectus and ample index. By Howard Malcolm, D. D. President of the University, Lewisburg, Pa. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co.—1857.

The reputation of *Butler's Analogy* is already established. It needs no commendation from us. It is appreciated by the thinkers of the day, and is used generally as a text-book in our best Colleges. The edition before us is the most complete and satisfactory which we have yet examined, and is worthy the attention of those who are giving instruction in our Literary Institutions. The *Conspectus* is an exceedingly valuable part of the work; so full is it, that if mastered by the pupil, he will have a very good idea of the discussion itself. The *Index* also is quite extensive, and will be found most useful to the scholar for reference. The mechanical execution of the work is very attractive, and must have the effect of increasing the student's interest in the work itself.

Mental Philosophy: including the Intellect, Sensibilities and Will. By Joseph Haven. Professor of Intellectual and Moral Philosophy, Amherst College. Boston: Gould and Lincoln.—1857.

This work has been for some time before the public, and has received the approval of some of our most accomplished instructors. It has been adopted as a text-book in some of the leading institutions of the land. It is an admirable treatise. Distinguished for clearness of thought, perspicuity of arrangement, richness of illustration and beauty of style, the book cannot fail to meet with favor, where its merits are known.

INDEX TO VOL. IX.

African Slave Trade, 32
Aimwell Stories 449
Albert, Rev. L. E. Art. by 412
Alexander's Am. Sunday School Union 147
A life with Christ in God 137
Allibone's memoir 137
American Sunday School Union 147
An introduction to the study of Philosophy 447
Ansprech's Pilgrims 445
Arctic Explorations 135
A study for young men 140
Awakened, treatment of the 287
Baccalaureate Address 109, 267, 421, 581
Bachman's Educational Address 451
Baillie's Life Studies 442
Barrow's Logic 141
Bayne's Essays on Biography and Criticism 448
Bergman, Rev. J. E. memoir of 13
Birney's Life of Buxton 140
Bolzius, Rev. J. M. memoir of 1
Bonar's desert of Sinai 135
Breckenridge's Theology 440
Brown, Rev. J. A. Art. by 91
Buchanan's Modern Atheism 137
Butler's Analogy 596
Buxton's memoir 140
Christian Doctrine, digest of 151
Christian Principle—its influence upon Government 564
Church History, Guericke's 144
Classics, Study of the 401
Colleges, value of 220
Conrad, Rev. F. W. Art. by 220
Concordance, Eadie's 138
Coppee's Logic 449
Das Apostolische 145
Desert of Sinai 133
Diary and Correspondence of Amos Lawrence 138
Diehl, Rev. G. Art. by 19
Digest of Christian Doctrine 151
Discoveries in Biblical Chronology 436
Early History of the Lutheran Church 115
Education, Ministerial 412
Eloquence 586
Focht, Rev. D. H. Art. by 530
Frederic the Wise 451
General Synod of 1857 176
German Theology 292
Gerhart's Logic 447
German Reformed Liturgy 445
German Universities 129
Gnomon of the New Testament 443
Gotthold's Emblems 141
Hallig 297
Hamilton's Lessons 443
Harbaugh's Life of Schlatter 144
Haven's Mental Philosophy 596
Heydenreich, Rev. L. W. Art by 50
Homiletic Studies 338
Human Nature 522
Huntington's Sermons for the people 139
Kane's Arctic Expeditions 135
Keil's Commentary on Kings 445
Keller, Rev. Emanuel, memoir of 515
Krauth, Rev. Dr., Art. by 109, 115, 120, 267, 421, 426, 522, 581
Krauth, Rev. C. P. Art. by 301
Krauth's Rev. C. P., Thanksgiving Sermon 450
Krauth's Bible Address 147
Krotel, Rev. G. F., Art. by 356
Kurtz' Bible and Astronomy 447
Lamartine's Memoirs of celebrated characters 135
Lawrence's Correspondence 138
Luther as a pulpit orator 486
Man 426
McPherson Edward, Art. by 564
Memoir of Susan Allibone 137

Miller Rev. Dr. G. B. Art. by 401
 Miracles 530
 Moeller Rev. Henry, memoir of 273
 Montgomery's Life 417
 Morris Rev. Dr. J. G. Art. by 486
 Muhlenberg's Companion to the
 Catechism 449
 New Theology 91, 256, 446
 Norse-folk 298
 Notices of New Publications 135,
 297, 440, 595
 Officer Rev. M. Art. by 32
 Our General Synod 76
 Pastoral visits to the sick and the
 dying 356
 Poor boy and merchant prince 448
 Practical influence of Religious
 History 19
 Prospectus of Ninth Volume 148
 Reed's British Poets 595
 Religious History, Influence of 19
 Reminiscences of Lutheran Clergy-
 men 1, 273, 378, 511
 Ruthrauff, Rev. John, memoir of
 384
 Ruthrauff, Rev. Jonathan, memoir
 of 390
 Saxon Electors 451
 Schaeffer, Rev. Dr. C. F. Art. by 4
 Schaeffer's History of the Luther-
 an Church 115
 Schaff's Germany 129
 Schlatter's life 144
 Schmid's Dogmatik 496
 Schmucker, Rev. Dr. S. S. Art by
 251
 Scholastic and Biblical Theology 50
 Seiss, Rev. J. A. Art. by 151
 Seiss' Address on the Arts of De-
 sign 147
 Seiss' Sermon at Staunton 147
 Seyffarth's reply to Queries 58
 Sharretts, Rev. N. G. memoir of
 511
 Sheeleigh's Valedictory Discourse
 480
 Signet Ring and its Heavenly Mot-
 to 140
 Stoever, Prof. M. L. Art. by 1, 76,
 273, 378, 511
 Stork's Home Scenes of the New
 Testament 136
 Streit, Rev. Christian, memoir of
 378
 Theological Encyclopedia and Me-
 thodology 278
 Tholuck on John 301
 Travels and Researches in Chaldea
 134
 Treatment of the Awakened 237
 Value of Colleges 220
 Webster's Dictionary 220
 Ziegler, Rev. H. Art. by 237

